MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.
20 September 1966

INDEX

	Page
ADMINISTRATION*	
Status of Special Studies	
a. Graphics and Street Furniture Study	1
b. Parking Lot Study	1
c. Historic Georgetown Survey	2
d. The President's Council on Recreation & Natural Beauty	2
SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS	
1. Pennsylvania Avenue Commission	
a. Paving and Landscaping of Pennsylvania Avenue	2
b. National Gallery, Sculpture Garden	2
c. Reflecting and Skating Pool	3
2. Lafayette Square Park	3
3. National Capital Transportation Agency	
Subway Designs and Station Locations	3
4. District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency	
a. Tenth Street Mall	
(1) Overlook and Parking Facilities	3-4
(2) Lighting Standards	4
5. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Svc	
a. Air Rights Building	4
b.=c. Howard University, Physical Education Building for Women and University Center Building	4-5
d. Gerontology Building, NIH-Selection of Artist	5

* Dates of Next Meeting
Proposed Budget

6. American Battle Monuments Commission

Guam Memorial 5

7. Department of the Treasury, Bureau of the Mint

New York City National Shrines Medal 5

8. District of Columbia Government

a. District Commissioners

Review of Presbyterian Church Tower 5

b. Department of Licenses and Inspections

Shipstead-Luce Act

(1) Extension of CFA Authority to N.Y. Ave., N.E. 6

(2) Office Bldg., 1510 H St., N.W. 6

(3) Office Building, South Capitol & E Sts., S.W. 6

(4) Union Station, Resurfacing of Concourse Roof 6

(5) Appendix I 6

Old Georgetown Act

(1) Georgetown University Library 6-7

(2) Appendix II 7

LEGISLATION 7-8

INTERVIEWS

1. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Svc 8

Air Rights Bldg. 8

2. Pennsylvania Avenue Commission

a. National Gallery Sculpture Garden 8-9

b. Reflecting and Skating Pool 9

3. Lafayette Square Park 9-10

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

A regular monthly meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on 20 September 1966. The members met, pursuant to notice, in executive session at 10:30 a.m., with William Walton, Chairman, presiding.

Present were: William Walton
Gordon Bunshaft
Burnham Kelly
Theodore Roszak
Aline Saarinen (morning session)
Hideo Sasaki
John Carl Warnecke

Staff: C.H. Atherton, Secretary
Donald Myer, Asst. Secretary
Nancee Black, Legislative Asst.
Myra Younker, Editor

Recorder: Steve Miller

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. Dates of the next meeting:

Wednesday - Thursday, 19-20 October 1966 were selected;
Tuesday - Wednesday, 15-16 November 1966 tentatively selected.

2. Proposed Budget - Fiscal Year 1968.

Preliminary estimate of $115,000 was approved.

3. Status of Special Studies

The Secretary reported:

a. Graphics and Street Furniture Study by Cambridge Seven Associates, Inc., should be ready for presentation during the November meeting.

b. Parking Lot Study by Collins and DuTot, landscape architects, should be ready for the November meeting.

c. Historic Georgetown Survey, a joint venture of the Commission and the National Park Service as a part of the Historic American Buildings Survey, was made of selected commercial buildings on M Street and Wisconsin Avenue. Twenty-six studies covering one or more buildings per study were made during the summer. Historic and architectural data, and photographs of buildings surveyed will be used as a guide by the Old Georgetown Board of Architectural Consultants. The staff was assisted by Dr. James Philip Noffsinger, University of Kentucky, and Thomas R. Martinson, architectural student, University of Minnesota. Many volunteers also assisted in the program and will continue.

d. The President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty - Report of the Council - will include all of the above studies. The program developed for Washington, D.C. should be applicable to other cities throughout the country.

III. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

The Secretary presented and discussed the following projects.

1. Pennsylvania Avenue Commission

a. Paving and Landscaping of Pennsylvania Avenue, designed by Dan Kiley, site and landscape consultant. A model, report, and drawings were reviewed. Paving brick would be used for the avenue and Swenson gray granite for the sidewalks. Triple rows of Linden trees would be planted along the north side and double rows of Lindens along the south where existing oaks would be retained until the Lindens matured.

The Commission felt that the dense planting of trees would obscure buildings designed specifically for the Avenue and recommended that the plan be restudied. No further review on the following day was necessary, and the plan was withdrawn by the Pennsylvania Avenue Commission.

b. National Gallery Sculpture Garden, designed by Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, architects. A model and preliminary drawings were submitted. West of the National Gallery of Art in the Mall Park, the walled Garden would relate to an underground garage. A circular pool with a square island in it was planned for the center. Pools on the east/west axis would have a cascade strip between them. Sculpture would be placed within grassed sections which would be separated by hedges and gravelled paths. A restaurant was planned for the center of the north side.

The Commission felt that the scheme should be more open and the axial pattern clearly defined. If the garden were sunk and had a wall background, people in minibuses or walking would have a vista of the Mall as well as the garden and sculpture.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the architects during the afternoon session.

c. Reflecting and Skating Pool, East End of the Mall, designed by the Pennsylvania Avenue Commission staff at the suggestion of the Secretary of the Interior. Located in front of the Grant Memorial, the pool would be divided into three parts with the center section developed for ice skating. The Commission felt that this was inappropriate for a formal site. The members disapproved the plan and recommended that only a formal reflecting pool be designed.

Final action was withheld until a conference with officials of the Pennsylvania Avenue Commission during the afternoon session.

2. Lafayette Square Park - Feasibility Study. (Added to Order of Business) Designed by John Carl Warnecke and Associates, architects, for the National Park Service. Detailed drawings indicated the addition of kiosks, pools, sitting areas, and the large urns placed at the H Street entrance.

The Commission felt this design was too complicated and inappropriate. The members confirmed their May 1965 views that all new work should strengthen and reinforce the existing character of the park.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the architects during the afternoon session.

3. National Capital Transportation Agency

Subway Designs and Station Locations designed by Harry Weese, architect. Preliminary sketches indicated a strong, definite approach to design for each station site. Stations would have mezzanines and center loading platforms. Stations would be located in Farragut Square and Judiciary Square. Design of the parks would be unchanged.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the architect on the following day.

4. District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency

a. Tenth Street Mall

(1) Overlook and Parking Facilities, designed by Dan Kiley, landscape consultant. Drawings and a model indicated a new concept for the Tenth Street Mall terminus. A circular overlook replaced the previously approved elliptical overlook and was smaller in size. Parking was provided in a large fan-shaped area, shielded visually by overhead concrete trellises.

The Redevelopment Land Agency felt that this large parking plan was necessary for commercial facilities on the proposed Ponte Vecchio Bridge and the adjacent government facilities. Having reviewed drawings submitted to them during the summer, the members restated their opposition to surface parking in this area.

Final action was withheld until a conference with officials of RLA on the following day.

(2) Lighting Standards, designed by Araldo A. Cossutta, architect. Photographs of a full-scale model showed a double standard with clear globe lights - four at an equal height and a fifth, higher. A solid center piece would contain signs. The members stressed that incandescent lighting be used.

Final action was withheld until a conference with RLA officials on the following day.

5. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. Air Rights Building, 3rd and Independence Avenue, S.W. - Feasibility Study developed by Marcel Breuer and Associates, and Nolen-Swinburne and Associates. The Commission had previously recommended that this important site near the Capitol and Mall be used for a government building which could mask the tunnel of the six-lane freeway.

A model adaptable for two heights, drawings, and a resume of the study were submitted. The plans indicated a main floor with mezzanine area, five office floors, and a penthouse area. Three basement levels would provide underground parking for approximately 500 cars. Exterior materials would be glass and concrete. All window frames and doors would be in dark anodized aluminum.

The members discussed the two heights proposed for the building in relationship to surrounding structures - Rayburn Building, Health, Education and Welfare Department Building, etc. They felt elevation drawings indicating the roof lines on both sides of the Mall would clarify the problem of height. The design was considered appropriate for the site.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the architects on the following day.

b.-c. Howard University, proposed designs for Physical Education Building for Women and University Center Building developed by Justement, Elam, Callmer and Kidd. A model and drawings of preliminary designs for both buildings were reviewed.

The Commission felt the selected sites and the design concepts for these buildings were appropriate. No further discussion of this project was deemed necessary. GSA officials were notified of the Commission's approval in general with a request that detailed drawings and exterior materials be submitted for review. EXHIBIT A

d. Gerontology Building, NIH - Selection of Artist

After reviewing photographs of work by Ellsworth Kelly and Raymond Parker, the Commission recommended that the architect of the building, located in Baltimore, Md., select the artist as both were well qualified to design a mural for the lobby.

GSA was informed of the Commission's decision. EXHIBIT B

6. American Battle Monuments Commission

Guam Memorial, designed by John Carl Warnecke and Associates. Drawings of the preliminary plans for the memorial indicated native materials would be used for the landscaping and stonework. Two motifs - a lookout with sculpture - appeared unrelated in design. The members felt the design should be simplified.

The Commission requested that the design be restudied. The American Battle Monuments Commission was informed of the Commission's request. EXHIBIT C

7. Department of the Treasury, Bureau of the Mint

New York City National Shrines Medal, designed by the staff of the Bureau of the Mint. Copies of a drawing of a design for the obverse side of the proposed Ellis Island National Shrine medal was submitted for the Commission's comments. The reverse design of the medal would be that used for other medals of the New York City National Shrines series.

The Commission disapproved this overcrowded design. The Bureau of the Mint was notified.

8. District of Columbia Government

a. District Commissioners

Review of Presbyterian Church Tower (cancelled).

b. Department of Licenses and Inspections

Shipstead-Luce Act

(1) Extension of CFA Authority to New York Avenue, N.E., would probably require legislation. Control of building designs and sign regulations are necessary to provide an orderly development of the area.

The Commission approved extending CFA authority to New York Avenue. A draft of a proposal on this subject will be submitted for the members approval.

(2) Office Building, 1510 H Street, N.W., designed by Wendell H. Hallett, architect. Drawings submitted indicated a 9-story building of light colored exterior material which did not blend with adjacent structures. Verticality was emphasized in the design which was considered inappropriate. Final action was withheld until a conference with the architect on the following day.

(3) Office Building, South Capitol and E Streets, S.W., designed by Weihe, Black, and Kerr, architects. Site plan and preliminary designs were submitted for an 8-story building with underground parking on two basement levels. The Commission approved the general site plan and preliminary design.

The Commission's action was reported to the Department of Licenses and Inspections with a request that samples of exterior materials and more detailed information on the roof structures be submitted.

(4) Union Station, Resurfacing of Concourse Roof, submitted by C.R. Howell, engineer, Washington Terminal Company. Plans to apply asphalt primer over the entire roof area included covering the skylight. Considering the skylight to be the dominate feature of the concourse in this historic structure, the Commission felt that the roof should be restored to its original design. No approval could be given to this plan.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the engineer on the following day.

(5) Appendix I

Although no formal action was taken on Appendix I, it is considered approved. EXHIBIT D

Old Georgetown Act

(1) Georgetown University Library , designed by John Carl Warnecke and Associates, architects. Changes to the elevations and a sculptural quality on some of the vertical elements were indicated in the model and drawings submitted for review. The site remained unchanged. The transcript of the meeting covering the members' discussion of the site is submitted as EXHIBIT E. Plans were made for the members to visit the site

at 10:15 a.m. on the following day before final action would be taken.

(2) Appendix II

Although no formal action was taken on Appendix II, it is considered approved. EXHIBIT F

IV. LEGISLATION

The Secretary presented and discussed the following proposed legislation. Copies of the legislation and the Commission's reports on them are listed as exhibits.

1. H.J.Res. 1232-7/26/66-Mr. Scheuer-89th C, a joint resolution "To provide for the formulation, adoption, administration, and periodic updating of a comprehensive development plan for the United States Capitol Grounds and contiguous related and influencing areas." Approved. EXHIBIT G

2. H.R. 14205-5/10/66-89th Congress, an act "To declare the Old Georgetown Market a historic landmark and to require its preservation and continued use as a public market, and for other purposes." Approved. EXHIBIT H

3. H.R. 12119-89th Congress, a resolution "To authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to replace the existing Fourteenth Street Bridge, also known as the Highway Bridge, across the Potomac River, and for other purposes." Approved. EXHIBIT I

4. H.R. 17124-8/17/66-Mr.Whitener-89thC, a resolution "To authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to lease airspace in freeway rights-of-way within the District of Columbia." Approved with recommendation that the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts be required on designs of all air rights buildings and not limited to those constructed within the Shipstead-Luce Act Area. EXHIBIT J

5. S.J. Res. 116-10/17/65-Mr. Jackson-89thC, a joint resolution "To provide for the administration and development of Pennsylvania Avenue as a national historic site." Approved. EXHIBIT K

6. S.J.Res. 119-10/19/65-Mr. Simpson-89thC, a joint resolution "Authorizing the Hungarian Freedom Fighters" Federation to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs." Disapproved with a statement made that the proposed memorial had no national significance. EXHIBIT L

7. S. 3398-5/25/66-Mr. Carlson-89thC, a bill "To provide for the installation of an eternal flame at the Tomb of the Unknowns in Arlington National Cemetery." Disapproved with a statement made that the Tomb of the Unknowns required no additions or changes. EXHIBIT M

8. S. 3521-6/16/66-Mr. Muskie-89thC, a bill "To foster high standards of architectural excellence in the design and decoration of Federal Public Buildings outside the District of Columbia, and to provide a program for the acquisition and preservation of works of art for such buildings, and for other purposes, to be known as the Federal Fine Arts and Architecture Act." Approved, provided the method sited and alternative ways of accomplishing the objectives of this legislation are thoroughly explored before this bill is enacted into law. Services of the Commission in formulating an appropriate method will be offered to Congress. EXHIBIT N

9. S. 3602-7/12/66-Mr. Yarborough-89thC, a bill "To prohibit, without the express approval of Congress, any construction which would result in altering the proportions, changing the size, or modifying the United States Capitol Building in any substantial manner, and to establish a commission to study the existing and future needs of the Congress with respect to such building." Approved. EXHIBIT O

V. INTERVIEWS

1. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

Air Rights Building, 3rd and Independence Avenue, S.W.-Feasibility Study

Representatives of Public Buildings Service - J. Rowland Snyder and Karel Yasko, and the architect, Marcel Breuer, attended the meeting to discuss the model and drawings for this project.

Preferring the taller height, the architect commented that the use of exposed metal for the penthouse was dependent on fire regulations. Discussing the project in detail, the members of the Commission approved in general the site, mass, shape, higher height, and design concept developed in this study. They felt that precast concrete should be used for the entire building.

The Commission's action was reported to Public Buildings Service.EXHIBIT P

2. Pennsylvania Avenue Commission

Representing the Pennsylvania Avenue Commission, John Woodbridge, architect, discussed the following two projects during the afternoon session.

a. National Gallery Sculpture Garden

Treated as a walled garden for security reasons, the sculpture garden would have a series of sections (outdoor rooms) of varying size and shape. It was planned to serve several functions - a beautiful garden, an area where concerts might be given, and a small restaurant pavillion which

could be open even when the garden is closed. Lighting at night would be directed primarily at the sculpture. Plans indicated a flight of steps leading into the garden. These would be opposite the Seventh Street entrance to the National Gallery and would relate eventually to a bridge over the Seventh Street depression which will lead in the future to the underpass under the Mall.

The Commission discussed the details of the plans concluding in general that a garden designed in a traditional manner rather than formal might be more appropriate now and in the future for the placement of the sculpture as it is received. The plans appeared out of scale and overdone, the shapes of the sections unresolved, and the sculpture incidental to the design. The members felt the axial relationship to the Mall required restudy.

The Commission's comments were forwarded to the Pennsylvania Avenue Commission.

b. Reflecting and Skating Pool, East End of Mall

The Commission approved the concept of a large reflecting pool at this site but unanimously disapproved any skating facility on the central axis of the Mall at either end. If a skating pool is planned for the Mall, it should be located in the peripheral area under the trees or in the small areas adjacent to the Mall. The central area of the Mall must remain uncluttered. The members agreed that the street in front of this proposed reflecting pool should be narrower than indicated in the drawings.

The Commission's actions were reported to the Director of the National Park Service. EXHIBIT Q

3. Lafayette Square Park (added)

Representing John Carl Warnecke and Associates, architects, Michael Painter attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

The Commission requested that the design concept previously approved be developed for this park which is in historic juxtaposition with the White House. Kiosks, adult sitting areas and child play areas were inappropriate. The pools on the east/west axis should be reduced and placed flush with the grass. The site for the urns at the H Street entrance was approved. Plans for flowers planted at the base of the corner statues would be resolved later. The members stressed that this project is primarily one of reinforcement. Materials for the lip of the pools, paths within the park, and side walk should be of the best quality materials.

The Commission's views were forwarded to the National Park Service.EXHIBIT R

The meeting adjourned at 5:26 p.m. to reconvene at 9:30 a.m. on the following day.

Respectfully submitted,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

10 October 1966

Dear Mr. Knott:

This will confirm the Commission's approval of the Physical Education Building for Women and Student Center Building at Howard University, which were presented at our September meeting.

The new structures appear to fit nicely in the over all pattern of the campus at this stage. Of course the final success of the buildings will depend on careful selection of materials and detailing consistent with the neighboring buildings. To this end the Commission will be glad to work closely with the architect in developing further studies.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Honorable Lawson B. Knott
Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit A

10 October 1966

Dear Mr. Knott:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on September 21st, approved of the selection of either Elsworth Kelly or Raymond Parker to execute a mural in the lobby of the Gerontology Building in the National Institutes of Health, Baltimore, Md.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Honorable Lawson B. Knott, Jr.
Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit B

10 October 1966

Dear General North:

Designs for the proposed Guam Memorial were presented at the September 21st Commission of Fine Arts meeting. The Commission approves the designs provided only a single straight wall is used and the semi-circular bulge around the sculpture is eliminated.

The circular element has no functional necessity and is too similar in size to the old fort. A simple straight wall with the sculpture mounted above it would be adequate. We would be glad to review further studies when they are ready.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Major General Thomas North
Secretary
American Battle Monuments Commission
Munitions Building
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit C

9/21/66
9/20/66

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS

NO SL 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
16	So. Cap. & E Sts., SW Marfair Joint Venture	8-story off. bldg. with 1st fl. commercial space & 2 basem. levels of parking.
ACTION: Ret'd. for add'l. inf. See attached memo. to Mr. J. P. Green, dtd. 8/26/66, 8/26/66.		
17	50 Mass. Ave., NE Wash. Terminal Co.	Roof over main concourse. Warning signs.
ACTION: Ret'd. for further study. Recom. consideration of restoration of exist. glazing or, as a less desirable alternative, the installation of a lighting system within the roof truss in order to duplicate the interior lighting scheme within the concourse if the roof glazing is to be eliminated, 9/14/66.		
18	1510 H St., NW Barney Dreyfuss, & Richard J. Donohoe, Trustees	10-fl off. bldg.
ACTION: Ret'd. for further study of H St. elevation. Request conf. with arch's. at Sept. 21st meet. of CFA, 9/14/66.		
21	748 Jackson Pl., NW Natl. Trust for Hist. Preser.	Small masonry platform & steps to secondary means of egress on H St.
ACTION: App'd., 9/9/66.		
22	331-1st St., NE Senate Plaza Corp.	1 solid red canvas awning with fixed iron frames & posts above doorway.
ACTION: App'd., 9/13/66.		

APPENDIX 1

Exhibit D

NO SL 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
23	2201 Va. Ave., NW Riverside Assoc.	Extension of adjoining neighbor's furnace stack to 3' above roof level per D. C. Bldg. Code requirements. Actual work is on adjoining lot.

ACTION: Disap'd. Substitute brick stack approx. 2' deep & 3' wide for exposed metal stack, starting at 4th fl. level & extending 3' above cornice. Brick to match exist. apt. house wall. Subm. revised draw's., 9/20/66.

24	So. Cap. & E St., SW Marfair Joint Venture	Mock-up model of bldg. 8-story office bldg.

ACTION: App'd. for general siting, mass & prel. design. Subm. more accurate inf. on roof structures & mechanical equip., etc. Also subm. material samples, 9/21/66.

25	1510 H St., NW Dreyfuss, & Donohoe, Trustees	10-fl. off. bldg.

ACTION: Restudy character of facade, substituting a more neutral & subdued treatment for the exaggerated verticality of the proposed design. Suggest modular masonry facade with color in the range of limestone or darker gray granites, & with dark glass. Set structure back from the bldg. line 3 or 4 feet to achieve better relation to adjacent structures, 9/21/66.

26	50 Mass. Ave., NE Wash. Terminal Co.	Roof over main concourse. Warning signs.

ACTION: Disap'd. See attached ltr. dtd. 9/21/66 to Assistant Superintendent of Licenses & Permits, 9/21/66.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

WILLIAM WALTON, Chairman
GORDON BUNSHAFT — ALINE B. SAARINEN
BURNHAM KELLY — HIDEO SASAKI
THEODORE ROSZAK — JOHN CARL WARNECKE
CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

September 21, 1966

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON

Dear Mr. Green:

At its meeting on 21 September, the Commission of Fine Arts carefully considered the application by the Washington Terminal Company to cover over the glass skylight on the roof of the concourse at Union Station. The work as presently proposed would have the effect of shutting off the light that comes through the glazed ceiling over the passenger space thus changing entirely the character and design of the room as originally conceived. Under no circumstances would the Commission approve such a change. The Commission considers this building to be one of the important landmarks in the nation's capital and every effort should be made to protect and preserve this building in its original form.

We understand completely the nature of the problems of leakage in the roof facing the terminal management, but we do not agree with their solutions. Either the roof must be repaired, retaining the glazing and copper flashing in its present form or a system of lighting within the interior of the truss must be installed to simulate natural lighting conditions if any modification is to be made to the skylight. This latter method will probably entail considerable expense and as such is far less desirable than limiting the project to minor repairs of the existing condition. We therefore strongly recommend the former course.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Julian P. Green
Assistant Superintendent
of Licenses and Permits
106 District Building
Washington, D. C. 20004

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS SEP 1 2 1966

NO SL 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
6	30 E St., SW C & P Telephone Co.	Constr. structural steel Micro-wave tower on roof of exist. bldg.

ACTION: App'd. Structure to be painted medium gray, 8/10/66.

15	1700 Penna. Ave., NW Colonial Parking Co.	1 s-f, 24.5 sq-ft sign. Back-lighted green ltrs. with white bckgd.

ACTION: Resubm. using Duranodic Alum. finish to match other arcade signs for this bldg. Use opaque brown ltrs. Mount top of box flush with soffit eliminating alum. trim screen. Mount sign 6" behind column faces, 8/26/66.

19	331-1st St., NE Plaza Hotel	Air-cond. unit. Location of proposed equipment as requested in SL 67-10.

ACTION: App'd., provided all units are painted neutral gray & are placed a minimum of 30' behind bldg. line, 8/30/66.

20	2023 Allen Pl., NW Benjamin Jurin, MD	Chg. front windows from two 34" double sash openings to 1 opening (incls. wall area between the 2 windows) to an 8'-6" x 9' window with small pane window lights. Remove br. column supporting porch from top of balustrade to porch roof & replace with w.i. column.

ACTION: Disap'd. Exist. window arrangement more appropriate to character of house than proposed. Porch should either be entirely removed, such as on adjoining houses, or should remain intact as is, SEP 1 2 1966

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS

AUG 1 8 1966

NO SL 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
10	331-1st St., NE Nick Berbakos	Install air-cond. unit above passageway & 1st fl. kitchen between 6-story front & 4-story rear of Plaza Hotel.
ACTION: Ret'd. for add'l. inf. Indicate location of proposed equipment in plan, 8/3/66.		
11	301-1st St., NE Carroll Arms Hotel	1 s-f, 24 sq-ft sign flat against bldg. Change name on exist. sign to The Capitol Hill.
ACTION: Disap'd. New neon signs or changing text is not permitted in Shipstead-Luce Act areas. Substitute simpler block ltrs. of classical design & with uniform size back-lighted opaque-faced ltrs., AUG 1 8 1966		
12	4636 Broad Branch Rd., NW John Boyle	Encl. side porch.
ACTION: App'd., 8/2/66.		
13	331-1st St., NE Senate Plaza Corp.	1 red & white canvas awning over front window & door to extend out from door to 1'-6" from curb. Fixed iron frames & posts.
ACTION: Disap'd. Limit awning to single run from door to curb, omitting section over windows. Use one solid color only & use flatter shape as marked on drawings, AUG 1 8 1966		
14	310-1st St., SE Martin Bldg. Assn. for Capitol Hill Assoc., Inc.	2 schemes (A & B) for redesigned penthouse.
ACTION: App'd., for Scheme B, 8/5/66.		

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS AUG 2 1966

NO SL 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
7	1700 Pa. Ave., NW Colonial Parking, Inc.	1 s-f, 24.5 sq-ft sign back-lighted sign. Green ltrs. on white bckgd.

ACTION: Disap'd. Match this sign as to materials, colors, illumination & letter style to previously app'd. arcade hanging sign, S. L. 66-108, AUG 2 1966

8	1700 Pa. Ave., NW Oliver T. Carr	1 s-f, 18 sq-ft sign flat against bldg.

ACTION: No obj., to non-illuminated sign, 7/22/66.

9	2224 Cathedral Ave., NW Perry B. Simms	Remove front porch roof, add iron rail. around porch, add blinds to 5 windows, add carriage light, paint brick & trim off-white, paint blinds & rail black.

ACTION: App'd., 7/26/66.

REPORT OF ACTIONS ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS

JUL 2 0 1966

NO SL 66-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
104	2332 Mass. Ave., NW Dr & Mrs John M. Ide	Remove closed wood porches & small kitchen wing--flatten back wall add 2 decks (open). Interior alterations.
ACTION: App'd., 6/22/66.		
112	101 Const. Ave., NE Reserve Officers Assn. of US	Erect 5-story bldg. & 1 garage level for Reserve Officers Assn.
ACTION: App'd. Recom. all metal work on roof be painted to match bldg., 7/11/66.		
113	2300 Va. Ave., NW Columbia Plaza	2 tempo. constr. signs. 112 sq-ft each.
ACTION: App'd. as a tempo. sign for duration of constr., provided that both signs are located back of bldg. restriction line, 6/22/66.		
114	310-1st St., SE Capitol Hill Associates, Inc.	New stone & brick (painted white) office bldg.
ACTION: Disap'd. Location, character & size of penthouse inappropriate to bldg. Locate either on grade away from public view or in basement, 7/12/66.		
115	2216 Cathedral Ave., NW Jerry Oppenheimer	Remove front entr. porch & paint bldg.
ACTION: App'd., 6/22/66.		
116	2700 Va. Ave., NW Watergate	2 s-f signs. 48 sq-ft total area.
ACTION: App'd. for a location back of bldg. restriction line, to be mounted 8' above sidewalk, & to remain for duration of constr. along Va. Ave. only, 7/12/66.		

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS

JUL 1 9 1966

NO SL 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
1	1807 Sudbury Le., NW Henry Reich	Addn. of air-cond., plumb. & elec'l. work in connection with addn. previously app'd. & Permit #B-135677 issued.
ACTION:	App'd., provided the unit & ducts are apinted neutral gray, 7/14/66.	
2	3220 Conn. Ave., NW Darwin Corp.	Install basem. window on so. side of bldg. Install window & areaway facing Macomb St. & windows & door facing driveway on west side of bldg.
ACTION:	App'd., 7/14/66.	
3	301-1st St., NE Carroll Arms	Repaint exist. sign. 1 24 sq-ft, s-f sign. Metal, black. Illuminated.
ACTION:	App'd., 7/14/66.	
4	301-1st St., NE Carroll Arms	Install entr. on 1st. St. to match exist. Extend elevator penthouse, constr. brick wall, constr. cellar.
ACTION:	App'd., 7/14/66.	
5	212-2nd St., SE Ah Wong	Exist. show window facings to be covered with Kawneer Colorwall facing. Roof fascia covered with alum. mould. Install new Kawneer alum. & plate glass entry door.
ACTION:	App'd., subj. to approval of material samples, 7/14/66.	

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS JUN 2 4 1966

NO SL 66-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
95	301-1st St., NE Carroll Arms Associates	1 s-f, 25 sq-ft sign. Picture & backlighting on white bckgd.

ACTION: App'd. as a tempo. sign for duration of constr. only, provided that sign is relocated to middle of bldg. below ground fl. window sills, 5/18/66.

96	1510 H St., NW R.J. Donohoe, B. Dreyfuss	Raze exist. bldg. Constr. 9-fl. concrete frame office bldg.

ACTION: Request add'l. inf. on site plans. Subm. accurate scale elevations showing relation of proposed work to adjacent bldgs. Indicate cornice relationship & penthouse locations on roof. Subm. small model showing relation to neighboring structures, 7/8/66.

97	8100 East Beach Dr., NW Randall S. & B.J. Marshall	New dwelling with $\frac{1}{2}$ masonry & the other half frame.

ACTION: App'd. Request sample of material be submitted for review, 5/11/66.

98	7111-16th St., NW James A. Coles	New dwelling.

ACTION: App'd. Suggest using casement windows on front elevation, 6/8/66.

99	1720 Portal Dr., NW Lyn G. McLain	1-family dwelling.

ACTION: App'd., 6/8/66.

100	4220 Blagden Ave., NW N. W. Development	2-story dwelling with built-in garage. Bric, Cinder-block & frame.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Eliminate foyer buldge on front of house. Omit twin windows & use the same proportions on all glass lights. Restudy entry stairway, 6/8/66.

NO SL 66-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
101	2500 Va. Ave., NW Watergate	2 s-f signs. 48 sq-ft area total.

ACTION: Submit further inf. on sign locations & more accurate site plan, 6/15/66.

102 4218 Blagden Ave., NW — 1-story brick, c-block & frame dwelling.
N. W. Development

ACTION: Disap'd. Continue brick up into gable ends. Use matching sash with respect to height & proportion. Avoid the use of 3 different & unrelated types of sash on front of house. Subm. exact site plan showing existing trees & location & relation of house to sts. How the house relates to the st. & how the drive and walls are to be built are not indicated. Suggest bricking in complete end of carport incl. gable, JUN 24 1966

103 501-505 4th St., NW — Install steel supports for air-cond. on roof.
1st Trinity Lutheran Church

ACTION: App'd., 6/2/66.

105 2128 Cathedral Ave., NW — Constr. single-family row dwelling. 2 stories in height.
Edward Blanco

ACTION: App'd. in concept. Request add'l. inf. on landscaping treatment at front & rear of site. More exact inf. on exterior materials & treatment. Subm. small model showing relation to site, 6/16/66.

106 2132-2142 Cathedral Ave., NW — 1 tempo. real estate sign. s-f, 24 sq-ft.
J.F. Begg, Inc.

ACTION: App'd., provided sign is placed behind the bldg. line & sign is limited to name of project & name & phone no. of agent. Eliminate descriptive & price advertising, 6/8/66.

NO SL 66-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
107	3220 Conn. Ave., NW Darwin Corp.	Install new window on s. side of bldg. in basem., partially under bridge on Conn. Ave. Install new window & areaway facing Macomb St. & window facing driveway on w. side of bldg. as ordered by D. C. Dept. of L. & I., Housing Div.

ACTION: Disap'd. Keep new windows in character & alignment with exist. upper windows. Recom. that pairs of d/h sash be used consistent with exist. Select door with matching light size & proportions. See drawings, JUN 24 1966

108	1700 Penna. Ave., NW Hannah O. Klock et al	2 s-f, 25 sq-ft each signs. 1 on Pa. Ave. 1 on 17th St. Duronodic alum. with backlighted ltrs.

ACTION: 2 signs app'd., 1 on Pa. Ave. side as shown on drawings, 1 on center bay of 17th St. side, provided signs are mounted 6" behind outer column faces, 6/15/66.

109	420 No. Capitol St., NW Continental Hotel	Remove present sign (junk). Replace 1 new sign to indicate "RESTAURANT" location. 1 s-f 12 sq-ft sign.

ACTION: App'd., 6/15/66.

110	748 Jackson Pl., NW Nat'l. Trust for Historic Preser.	Build a stoop projection.

ACTION: App'd., 6/15/66.

MR. KELLY: Do they still have ultimate plan for extension to the west and another one to the south?

MR. ATHERTON: Yes. Not to the south. I think the extension we saw originally went over this way (indicating).

CHAIRMAN WALTON: West.

MR. KELLY: Eventually had wanted the south--

MR. BUNSHAFT: Extension.

MR. ATHERTON: This doesn't show the extension.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Is that parking?

MR. ATHERTON: Tennis courts.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Below there.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: On this lower side.

MR. ATHERTON: Over here is parking (indicating). This is all illustrated pretty well in the model over here. The architect submitted a profile drawing here showing the relationship of what would be seen across the water, directly across the river, in terms of the height of these towers and the building relationships. And this color is supposed to indicate general feeling, and it is to be as closely matched as possible to the granite of the old building.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, Gordon, will you lead off?

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, I am going to be as honest as I know how. I know nothing about this part of the city. In fact I don't know anything about Washington. And I have been going along on the idea that everybody here had a feeling that this was the wrong place for the overall community to

Exhibit E

7

going along with that. I have no feelings on it professionally because I don't know anything about it.. I really would like to understand that today, because this has gotten quite serious.

As far as I am concerned, there must be a very valid reason for not building on this corner. There are two things that came up in the earlier days [illegible] that this is the wrong place for a library. Well, we aren't doing a master plan of the university and really what we are talking about is whether there should be a building on this corner. If there is a good reason for not having a building of course I will go along with it, because that is not my field--

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We need the big map of the campus.

MR. BUNSHAFT: And the neighborhood.

MR. ATHERTON: Here is an aerial view.

MR. BUNSHAFT: If there is a real valid reason for not building something on this corner, superficially this is a pretty good attempt at integrating with the other buildings, and when you get into the plans it is superficial to a degree. We have approved a lot on that basis. So the issue to me, my feeling is that I really would like to understand why it is wrong to build on this corner so I can really defend our feeling, the Commission's previous votes sincerely.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: All right.

MR. SASAKI: I am in complete sympathy with Gordon's view on this. I think we more or less followed your lead as far as location of the site; and I think we then consistently supported Bill on his judgment. The building, I think, is rather good in relation to this, because it still leaves this as a dominance. This is a horrible building in there(indicating).

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Awful.

MR. SASAKI: So I end my remarks with a question of consideration of the site.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Do you want me to discuss my point of view?

MR. SASAKI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: This Commission has a special relationship to this section of the city because this is protected by Federal law of Georgetown, and we are the administrators of the old Georgetown Act through our Subsidiary Commission that we appoint. So that we have a double function in relation to this town, this piece of the town.

Now ordinarily, we have no final say over planning for instance; but we do in relation to Georgetown because by this act we are ordered to protect the character of this ancient part of the city. My feeling is that here is the site (indicating), here is the tennis courts (indicating), here is the present boundary of the campus (indicating),though they

will be on and off opertaing a couple of big buildings over here. They have, as you can see, vast open spaces all through here (indicating), though they do not operate this, but this is also Catholic territory, totally unused.

By the placement of this building, they are exerting pressure that will be successful in probably destroying three to six more blocks of the ancient city.

MR. BUNSHAFT: What is in that? Homes?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes. Of a varying degree, but nearly all are old. They are the ones that the Georgetown Act specifically orders to protect. This is the basis of my opposition to this location. No one is going to put a library on the absolute periphery of their campus unless they have to plan the campus still around it. Otherwise the very logical places for the library are Interior with the classrooms, and all the other buildings around it.

MR. KELLY: Could I speak on this?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes, sir.

MR. KELLY: It seems you should add a few more things. Of the 6 blocks they own about 80 percent of the first 3, and probably 20 percent of the total 6. The real question is whether the campus character, open grass, and buildings goes over to here or whether when they move over to here, which they surely will do (indicating), they will have to do what Harvard did to go out of the yard, and that is to follow the

basic pattern of the surrounding town.

The basic question is whether you move the campus as such, or whether you let Georgetown go into the town at the scale of the town, and this building is right on the edge (indicating)--

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It will be the most serious attack on the integrity of Georgetown as an area that has ever been made.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I can't get excited about that, Bill, because the university is going to grow; and I think if they own 80 percent of it, you are going to say they are going to grow in there. I think it would be kind of silly to -- I think what you are saying is that this is -- all universities are growing. You are saying, as I understand it, that this may grow into here (indicating).

MR. KELLY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: And they own the land. They own the old buildings, whatever they are.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: They have some buildings.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I am sure maybe that is why this will not be on the corner of the property. Are we saying the university should not grow?

MR. KELLY: Don't misunderstand me.

11

MR. BUNSHAFT: I am just asking.

MR. KELLY: I think we have to assume that Georgetown will buy two blocks into the town anyway. The question is whether that site is going to extend the campus, flatten out.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Our only consideration today is being intelligent about this project. I don't know anything about it. If they own 80 percent in here, it certainly implies they are going to build something. I don't see if they are going to build something, whatever pattern it is, that we can object to this building here, if we recognize they are going to build here (indicating).

You people said that, not me. I don't see what valid reason you have for not letting them build here. As far as I am concerned, it is a decorator. It is a nice little terminus for this place here. If we are going to say that this is going to remain residential for a long time, then it is a different subject.

MR. KELLY: That is not so. I remember in June, Gordon, we reached a point where we assumed that this would not only be built up, but fairly substantial buildings--

MR. BUNSHAFT: We have never discussed it as carefully as we are.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We did go into it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I am sorry.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I made the exact same speech, Mr. Kelly. I think we would assume that at some future date

that this would be substantial building over here, and the question is whether they would be campus type buildings or buildings of the scale of Georgetown. If they were a series of buildings, the weave in would get sort of a letter U here, and the library could be in one of those blocks.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We suggested that specific site.

MR. ROSZAK: We were talking about alternative sources.

MR. KELLY: If you could assume this has a U, you might not want to --

MR. BUNSHAFT: The only reason for dishing this one is that it is out of scale with the residential neighborhood next door. If this is going to be a university of some sort, there is nothing wrong in that location with this relatively low building, relatively low in relation to the university, not in relation to houses. And I don't think it is our prerogative to tell them to build it here (indicating). I think the only excuse of disapproving this is saying it is grossly out of scale for the people living over here. That is the only reason I can see. I am just talking now out loud.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Do you want to get my letter in which I state the Commission's position?

MR. ROSZAK: The site we had--

MR. KELLY: The site we did suggest, Father Collins --

we got a letter from Father Collins, and he said the site had been turned down.

MR. ROSZAK: Number 1, looking at this now, I don't see this is any overt violation of landscaping.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Vastly improved over what it was.

MR. ROSZAK: I think there was another point, however, that was important, and I don't know why it has not been brought up. That is, we are talking about the validity of the location of that building, strictly from the standpoint of appearances. But I think we are overlooking the sociological and cultural meaning of that building, that a library is not just a building, it is an important building in relationship to a university; and I think that it is extremely important for us to have more respect for the way in which the university authorities feel that this building is important in relation to these at the point of planning; and surely they are not going to kid themselves or fool themselves about appearances if they didn't think it was vital to the intellectual life of the university, and its relationship to the accessibility of Healey Tower. It seems to me that that should be as important a consideration in determining this site, perhaps even more so than the others.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: May I read this letter.

(Chairman Walton read a letter (dated 27 Jan 66) addressed to Father Collins, signed by Chairman Walton.)

MR. ROSZAK: The emphasis there is on the appearance of the building, isn't it?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, it is the planning question.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Did we say all of that? I don't see how we can defend putting in a library surrounded by three blocks of housing.

MR. KELLY: The assumption would be that all of those 6 blocks will eventually be university buildings. You have here a high piece of land looking to the south, if you could make the university library here, it would be more in the center of the new grouping of buildings. It would be accessible.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You are telling them where the center should be.

MR. KELLY: They gave us a plan showing this should be the center of activity.

MR. BUNSHAFT: If they had a group of buildings -- this is a wonderful terminus over this water.

MR. KELLY: The only argument we made, all things being equal, if you are going to have the site here -- then there is quite a terrain difference -- if you are not going to bring the street up and extend the campus, you might be better off to bring this building here and let that break stay where it is, looking out over the city (indicating).

MR. ROSZAK: Could I ask you, if you study this

column and you came to the conclusion that you must have a library in this particular relationship to other important buildings, wouldn't you have given it considerable thought prior to making that declaration in terms of the functions that the building would serve?

MR. KELLY: Don't misunderstand me, Ted, when we talked to the planners, they admitted this would be a more central location.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Correct.

MR. KELLY: They said that they couldn't get it.

MR. ROSZAK: If we give them that impasse, we would support the present campus site.

MR. KELLY: I think if we said, if they could not get those sites, we would have no alternative.

MR. SASAKI: That is really the key to the whole thing because, Gordon, I think it is twofold. I wouldn't make too much of this, although that is one thing, but I think a very important view was that if this were all trees and just leaving this as it is, it would be more desirable to have this building (indicating), I think if we can move this from the side, it would be desirable. Therefore, we thought of moving it there (indicating). That was our first choice, and we recommended this.

Let's say that they conscientiously tried to get that site, and they couldn't. Then now the question I have

16

to ask, is what do we do now?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Atherton, did the Planning Commission disapprove that site that we suggested?

MR. ATHERTON: Yes, it did disapprove it. The action they have taken now permits the boundary to extend in a rather zig zag area through that area with reduced heights. I think 40 along residential perimeter, and 60 back further. Also the Zoning Commission has not officially acted on this; but they did mention it in their action by saying that they would be opposed to anything east of 37th Street.

MR. BUNSHAFT: They have approved the location of the library?

MR. ATHERTON: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Can't we say in the light of your sincere effort to seek another site, and in view of your architect's reducing the--

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I don't believe it for a minute.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I am just trying to find out.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I am not opposing it. I don't think it is true for one bloody minute.

MR. SASAKI: I must say that I sympathize with Gordon's view. I would prefer this site, but in the event they made a conscientious effort to acquire another site, I would say approve this. In looking the total master plan, this area doesn't make too much sense -- this is that medical

17

center (indicating).

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes.

MR. SASAKI: I don't really know the extent of their holdings here (indicating).

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, they have got a massive athletic area over there that most universities had to move out into more distant areas.

MR. KELLY: Well, one factor is how sincere were their efforts on the one hand -- well, I remember Father Collins said they had to get the building started now in order to get it finished in time. They had already been threatened with losses of accreditation or something.

MR. ROSZAK: That is an important factor.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: They should have started it 10 years ago of course.

MR. KELLY: Anything we do to hold them up, it could be so difficult at this stage. The thing you don't see from the aerial photograph, I think, is the elevation change right at the edge of the campus.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think this is up on the big hill. You can probably enter the building on the upper campus and lower campus.

MR. KELLY: I mean from the building to the east.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I understand. So you can enter this library from the upper level as well as the lower level.

MR. SASAKI: I think if we look at the model, we can see it is a low building on this side and a high building on that side.

MR. KELLY: I am talking about the change from here over to here (indicating). Well I think, Bill, honestly that we get to the point where if they have made an honest effort and their hands are tied, we cannot hold them up.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It is up to the Commission to decide.

MR. BUNSHAFT: There has been one suggestion, what do you suggest we do?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I think there are plenty of other sites for them on their campus. I think there are many sites, and I think they have conducted a large scale campaign to pressure us into using this site. They have done it through Congress, Catholic Congressmen are always riding me and calling me. They have had a highly organized campaign of this kind.

MR. BUNSHAFT: They haven't done it to us.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I have gotten them.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I am sure you have. That is probably why you feel pretty strong about it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I have a different feeling about the importance of the preservation of the town of Georgetown. If we are not in favor of preserving it, we should resign

from the Commission because this is part of our legal responsibility to preserve that area of town. It is one of the minor responsibilities, but it is a very real one.

MR. ROSZAK: Could I ask you this, how old is the university?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It is late 18th Century.

MR. ATHERTON: 1789.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: One of the oldest in the country.

MR. ROSZAK: It is well over a hundred years, and I think that is important to remember that if we aren't defending the esthetic values that we are in effect talking about the values they indeed contributed to--

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Absolutely.

MR. ROSZAK: We cannot dismiss the values we are defending from the way Georgetown University has been principally involved in establishing those values. Therefore, it seems to me that if the organic growth of an institution which has been important to the community is so able to assert itself in time, it certainly is doing it in the consistent spirit of its original purposes and potential expansion. Therefore, it seems to me that we cannot completely say that Georgetown University is establishing a set of values which now are detrimental to the development of the cultural values of the community.

You are talking about the same kind of thing that you

began with over 100 years ago, and now we are concerned with another set of values, and therefore, it seems to me we must somehow underscore the importance of the sociological and cultural extension of a value in the life of a university important to the continuing interest of the educational activities and so on, and see that there must be some validity and some merit to this normal expansion in terms of their real needs.

It is a question of emphasis, it seems to me. Either we support something which is lovely and romantic in terms of archaic appearances than the more important sociological considerations of an organic development and expansion of ideas that have bearing upon a very important educational extension or--

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Your position would assume that this was the only site possible. I am in favor of them building a library, and a big library. They need it. I simply maintain this is not the only site. I don't believe them for one moment.

MR. ROSZAK: I am sure, Bill, there are any number of alternative sites that can be chosen.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That is all I am getting them to do.

MR. ROSZAK: They think it is important to have that building related to another set of buildings on the campus.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That is just the tennis courts.

MR. BUNSHAFT: This building, you know -- they only show the lower part here, but the lower lump is theoretically hidden.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Won't be long. Trees coming down.

MR. BUNSHAFT: This parking lot will take out the trees to the bottom floor?

MR. KELLY: You will see the building more than half way down.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Totally revealed.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I am not saying it is bad, but--

MR. ROSZAK: I think anything we do to landscape modifies it. Ultimately we have to live in such an area.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I would agree with you, Ted, completely, if I thought they didn't have another site. But there are acres that I think are available as a valid site for their library.

MR. ROSZAK: You have these problems constantly. Do you think they are right in making a choice for the library at this part of the campus?

MR. KELLY: All I know is what they presented to us. They presented a pretty careful expansion scheme, and a library in this location was reasonably located for classroom and daytime operations.

The big expansion they are building here is dormitories that you see going over to the west, and in the few blocks --

22

the 6 blocks or so to the east, and they expect there would be at least as much user demand in the future as there is now in areas to the west.

End Tape 7
SM:jmu

Tape 8.
SM:jmu

So the library somewhere in this central area would be ideally rational.

MR. SASAKI: Makes a lot of sense in the presentation of their master plan.

MR. KELLY: I think there has been a lot of study. I think they were reasonably honest to point out the existing sites above.

MR. SASAKI: I think the sites above here did not make too much sense; and any site along here made more sense. If they cannot get this site, well, they can't get it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: There is no reason that you cannot propose approval of this site and approve it..

MR. KELLY: If we would do so, I would want to write a letter back and say any further operation into Georgetown would have to follow the street pattern and--

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It won't mean anything, but you can.

MR. KELLY: With the street pattern you can.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Does some one want to make a motion to approve this?

MR. BUNSHAFT: I would like to talk a little bit. I think we ought to hear it out.

MR. SASAKI: Do you think it would be worth our while

to go out and see it?

MR. BUNSHAFT: I would like to get down to the issue. The issue is to justify putting a building on that location; the other one is to say there should not be a building on that location. Is that the issue?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: To me it is.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That is why I wanted to get to the issue. I don't know anything about the city; but if there is a big change in this level, if I were the president of this university, I would put a library which is kind of a spiritual thing of a university -- it is the heart of the university, and I would put it in the most dramatic location.

I would put it on the lower level.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It isn't the lower level.

MR. BUNSHAFT: This building here is up on a high point. Architecturally, this isn't a bad location, except it is surrounded on two sides by the university -- except what it will do in my book to this housing need of the future -- is there any other reason? You say protecting Georgetown. I am very much for protecting Georgetown. I can understand what harm it will do to Georgetown.

MR. KELLY: I want to give you a fact. There is big level changes from here down (indicating).

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Absolutely level across there.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Can somebody tell me where building

a library at this block is less harmful to old Georgetown than building it here (indicating)?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Most of that block is empty for one thing.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I am talking about there is going to be houses on 3 sides, isn't it? I am trying to understand. You said something about hurting Georgetown. I don't know. Maybe this is hurting less. I missed that meeting where you covered the site.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I am going to say over again, I think that the location of this will become more central to the campus than it is now; and it will mean the levels of surrounding buildings and expansion of the campus.

MR. ROSZAK: How is it going to level in the area -- I think the library will be the center, and not the periphery of the campus.

MR. BUNSHAFT: How do you stop that?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: There are a great many ways of stopping it. The Planning Commission has been very good about stopping it. There is an organization of citizens of Georgetown which are buying specific parts of blocks in order to preserve their own houses. They have gotten a common fund now that buys up houses as they come on the market to keep the university from destroying a whole block.

MR. ROSZAK: But that is an old story. It is the

same story as at N.Y.U. and somewhere else.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I can see somebody taking the position that the planners and everybody are not allowing the universit to move along this point that way. If somebody took that, you know, fine; but once you start talking about moving in here, you are not talking that. Are you talking to let them move it in here (indicating)?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Exactly the way we suggested in the letter.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I don't think it makes any difference where it is. I don't know -- we don't want a big thing here (indicating); but I can't see the difference between this site and this one.

MR. ROSZAK: I think the site they want to build it on is infinitely more desirable from this point of view than having it away--

MR. BUNSHAFT: I cannot see the difference.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well--

MR. SASAKI: Can I just make a couple more observation I think it is true, at least from my point of view, one reason why I didn't want it here (indicating), I should say the principal reason I didn't want it here (indicating), is because it would destroy the integrity of the wooded hill site That is why I thought it should go here (indicating), and then it wouldn't be pronounced.

But if you will look at this building or look at

this building site on the aerial photograph, which is right here, and I was asking you this, Charles, it is presently a tennis court and parking lot all the way up to here in any event (indicating), so the vegetation is just principally up to this row, and this is a little fringe here, but this much is parking lot and tennis courts (indicating).

CHAIRMAN WALTON: High retaining wall.

MR. SASAKI: High. Now what Warnecke has done is move this break in the ground here to here (indicating), and put this in (indicating); so again if this had to be a site, I would say that resolves it about as well as could be. And he doesn't destroy any trees here. He doesn't destroy any of this.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Those trees are probably real there.

MR. SASAKI: Yes. In that sense he has done well. Again I am speaking in favor of this design, you might say, still leaving the question of site open; but in the event that they cannot get -- our argument that we don't want the school to move into here seems to me somewhat tenuous, I think because we did suggest that.

So if we want to -- not we so much -- but the Planning Commission and the Zoning people want to shuffle them back this way, then it is a choice of here or there (indicating), it seems to me.

Do you thin that it would be possible to go that site

tomorrow sometime?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Absolutely.

MR. BUNSHAFT: What are those white things?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Houses. There is no reason in the world you can't approve it.

MR. ROSZAK: I think that a library cannot be judged in the same light as a garage, and I think that the meaning of that library in relation to an important administrative seat center and to the nearness of the center of an educational experience is very important; and I would support that location in view of the importance it plays on the campus.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I know you would, but I wouldn't.

MR. ROSZAK: We are talking about it, and I understand we have a right to express our opinion.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No more a nerve center than three blocks up, and it is still a nerve center.

MR. ROSZAK: Do you believe that?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: All the classes are not in -- there are a half dozen more buildings stretched on up the campus that this library serves. It isn't a one-classroom college, one-classroom building college.

MR. ROSZAK: Well it is more centrally located here than 3 blocks away, it seems to me.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, what is your pleasure, gentlemen?

28

MR. BUNSHAFT: I guess we ought to vote on it. I guess Aline is against it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Aline left the proxy voting no.

MR. ATHERTON: They are scheduled to come in tomorrow. I guess I should mention this before you vote.

MR. ROSZAK: I think this is very important and crucial the life of the university. I am for acceptance of the present site and design as now presented.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Do you present that in the form of a motion?

MR. ROSZAK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: All in favor?

MR. BUNSHAFT: I guess I am.

MR. KELLY: I guess I really want to go over and walk around on it.

MR. SASAKI: What time tomorrown can we sneak out and maybe the Howard University Buildings aren't very important

MR. BUNSHAFT: The time to sneak out is right now.

MR. SASAKI: I think it is serious enough to take a run out to see it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, we are not going to have a single thing to say to Howard University people, are we?

MR. BUNSHAFT: We don't have to see them.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We can tell them not to come. Just

29

let them go ahead, which would make us able to go about 10:30 tomorrow morning. What have we got after that?

MR. ATHERTON: You have a lot of shipstead stuff, office buildings.

MR. KELLY: If you are going to put a building there, I am saying Jack has done a reasonably good job.

MR. SASAKI: I personally feel -- I hate to vote on your motion -- but I have the tendency to go along.

MR. ROSZAK: I am simply stating that the social and educational implications of putting that building there are more important than anything I have heard so far.

MR. KELLY: If I had to vote yes on the motion, it would be I still feel extremely reluctant being placed in that location because of the desirability of keeping that hill free and clear, if possible; but if they have satisfied it is no longer possible to put it anywhere else, I reluctantly remove my objection.

MR. SASAKI: From 10:30 on we have Union Station and Office Building, and we approve those Office Buildings. You could cover that by letter.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You say in continuation of this plan here continues--

MR. ATHERTON: Continues to almost Prospect Street.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Just drops off.

MR. ATHERTON: This is Prospect here.

MR. BUNSHAFT: This is flat plain out to here.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: This is the tennis court.

MR. BUNSHAFT: What we are putting above that wall that now exists is what you see on this side?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, we are primarily concerned with the public view of this, not the campus view.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I am saying if you have a flat plain coming up here and dropping down, what is being added to this wall or embankment is what you see on this side, if that is a flat plain. Is that correct? Essentially in a broad sense, is that correct?

MR. SASAKI: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Instead of the wall, you have got architecture continuing below it.

MR. ATHERTON: It is not really a wall. It is a rather steeply landscaped bank, very steep. The parking lot will go out of there and there will be a hole back of about 75 or 100 feet.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You are really shoving the wall back. So you are not jeopardizing trees?

MR. ATHERTON: Those trees will be gone.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It will be totally exposed. You can be quite sure of that.

MR. BUNSHAFT: When you look at the picture with those houses farther off, there is a little two story house

that stands up pretty strong.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Do you want to look at it tomorrow? Is that what you want to do?

MR. SASAKI: I think it would make all of us a lot happier. I think in all fairness to this very important project really.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Is that satisfactory to you?

MR. KELLY: Yes, my inclination would be to reluctantly approve, but I think out of deference to your strong views we should see it in detail.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Charlie, will you lay it on for us?

MR. ATHERTON: How about these projects at 11:00 o'clock? It would be a good idea to get these Union Station people in here and tell them directly what out thinking is.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Why not tell him to come about 12:00 o'clock?

MR. ATHERTON: The one on South Capitol and E Street, there probably isn't any reason for them to come in.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No, no, we liked it.

MR. ATHERTON: How about the one on H Street?

We talked about different materials.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Let them come in here around 12:00.

MR. ATHERTON: I think we can take the subway. His slide show takes about 20 to 25 minutes at the most.

MR. BUNSHAFT: How long is the Shipstead-Luce?

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

OCT 1 2 1966

NO OG 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
49	1072 Thos. Jeff. St., NW Mrs. Ochs	Remodeling.

ACTION: Recom'. further study with more stress on simplicity. Considering the scope of change, wouldn't it be feasible to redesign & build an entirely new facade?, 9/30/66.

51	1413 Wisc. Ave., NW Wine & Cheese Shop	1 d-f, $5\frac{1}{4}$ sq-ft sign. Plywood. Gold ltrs. on black bckgd. Exist. sign to remain.

ACTION: No obj. to projecting sign in principle. Simplify supporting iron bracket & substitute rectangular sign panel, 9/30/66.

52	1642-33rd St., NW Richard Crenshaw	7' wood fence & trash storage.

ACTION: No obj., 9/30/66.

53	3129 N St., NW Beatrice Bulla	Lighting fixture at front entr.

ACTION: Recom'd., 9/30/66.

55	1611 Wisc. Ave., NW Randolph Reed, Jr.	1 d-f, $25\frac{1}{2}$"x$31\frac{1}{2}$" sign, on bldg. for parking lot. Wood, black & white.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Shape of sign too complicated & style of lettering inappropriate. Recom. a simple rectangular panel with plain classical letters, OCT 1 2 1966

56	1063 Wisc. Ave., NW Home & Garden Shop	3 canvas awnings, front entr. & showwindow. No fixed iron frames or posts. Gold, white & olive.

ACTION: Recom'd. for roll-type awning, omitting end panels & valances. Resubm. revised drawings, 9/30/66.

Exhibit I

NO OG 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
57	2515 P St., NW Froe Properties	Apt. Bldg.

ACTION: Ret'd. for further study of a simple 4-story st. facade with the elimination of all penthouse structures & balconies, & with a uniform fenestration. Incorporate segmental arches over 1st fl. openings. Also increase thickness of depth of piers on 1st fl. & lower lighting fixtures to approx. 6' above grade. Submit small-scale model showing general massing of bldg. in relation to 2 adjoining structures on P St. Model should incl. entire volume of bldg., 9/30/66.

58	1235-31st St., NW T. S. King	Light at basement entr.

ACTION: No obj., 9/30/66.

59	3138 "O" St., NW Ralph Stephan	New porch & steps with w.i. handrails on front. Paint front of house.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided that simple $\frac{1}{2}$"-square rails be substituted in entirety for decorative ironwork on balcony, 9/30/66.

60	3140 "O" St., NW Ralph Stephan	Replace front porch with new with w.i. handrails. Paint front brick wall.

ACTION: No obj., 9/30/66.

61	1210-31st St., NW Antique Shop	1 canvas awning over front windows with fixed iron frames, white.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided awning & valance remain free of signs, 9/30/66.

62	3200 S St., NW Jas. R. Hunt	Build addn. to exist. greenhouse.

ACTION: No obj., 9/30/66.

NO OG 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
63	1332-31st St., NW Wm. Kibler	6'-6" wood fence.
ACTION:	Resubmit with more clear accurate inf. as to location & type of fence, 9/30/66.	
64	1405-29th St., NW R. & C. Nicholas, III	Addn. to exist. dwelling.
ACTION:	Recom'd., provided st. side of addn. be brick to match house, 9/30/66.	
65	3316 M St., NW Action Pest Control Service, Inc.	Transfer present sign from 3326 M St., NW to 3316 M St., NW
ACTION:	No obj., 9/30/66.	
66	1210-30th St., NW Millicent Chatel	Retain two 8" concrete filled pipe bumper guards that protect 2 volnerable corners of old residence.
ACTION:	No obj., 9/30/66.	
68	1523 Wisc. Ave., NW Rose R. Hitt Beauty Salon	Replace exist. window & doors.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 9/30/66.	

9/21/66
9/20/66

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

NO OG 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
38	1650-32nd St., NW Katherine Brown	Masonry addn. on rear of exist. dwelling.
ACTION:	No obj., 9/9/66.	
40	3240 N St., NW Leo M. Bernstein	Paint front, reconstr. exist. steps in br. & br. ret. wall, concrete footings, w.i. rail. Replace exist. windows with divided sash 9x12 panes.
ACTION:	No obj., provided muntins are structurally integral with glass lights, 9/9/66.	
41	3342 Reservoir Rd., NW Lucille R. Trimble	Replace wood steps & platform with new brick steps & platform.
ACTION:	No obj., 9/9/66.	
43	3301 Dent Pl., NW E. Stuart Lyddane	Remove front & rear porch & paint exterior. Complete remodeling of interior. Replace front steps & porch.
ACTION:	Recom'd., provided all brick is painted a uniform neutral color, 9/9/66.	
Inf. 44	3051 Q St., NW Mrs. Francis Winslow	Carport, balconies, terrace & front steps.
ACTION:	Ret'd. for further study. Brick posts & balcony appear to lack structural sense. Brick posts are too thin. Supports for balcony appear unrealistic. What are platform materials, 9/9/66.	
45	1523 Wisc. Ave., NW Rose Raynor Hitt	Replace exist. window, relocate exist. entry.
ACTION:	Recom'd. restudy. Eliminate planting box. Make transoms alike. Harmonize 2 doors. Eliminate curved trim for simple rectangular panels. Recom. that entire front of bldg. be painted 1 color & fire escape be painted to match. Indicate signs, lights, etc., 9/9/66.	

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS (Continued)

NO OG 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
42	3214 P St., Nw Wilhelmina Adams	1 s-f, 10½ sq-ft sign over entr. door. Black ltrs. on white bckgd., gold leaf outline on ltrs. & gold leaf border around edge of sign.
ACTION: Not recom'd. Character of lettering unsuitable. Suggest uniform height, capital ltrs. of classical style, 9/20/66.		
46	3316 Dent Pl., NW Manuel G. Serra	Replace cement steps with brick.
ACTION: Ret'd. for further inf. Submit photo of exact steps to be replaced. Submit accurate drawing, 9/9/66.		
47	1400-35th St., NW Lt. Gen. Jas. Smith	Carport with tin roof to match tin roof of wood shed.
ACTION: Recom'd., 9/9/66.		
48	3252 N St., NW Leo M. Bernstein	New door trim & 2 fanlight windows. Remove terrace to street grade.
ACTION: Ret'd. for clear, corrected drawings, 9/19/66.		
50	1250-37th St., NW Georgetown.	Library
ACTION: Recom'd., provided further details & materials are subm'd. for consideration, 9/21/66.		

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS SEP 1 2 1966

NO OG 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
31	3294 M St., NW Sun Oil Co.	Remove exist. Sunoco Sign, repair, repaint & re-install on same base at above location.

ACTION: Not recom'd. for proposed work shown on application. Clarify exact description of proposed work. Also see previous actions regarding this sign, SEP 1 2 1966

32	1258 Wisc. Ave., NW Bishop Air-Cond. Co.	1 d-f, 10.5 sq-ft sign on exist. sign housing. White ltrs. on green bckgd. Metal.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Sign is out of character & does not conform to requirements of OG Act, SEP 1 2 1966

33	1686-32nd St., NW S. D. Kuser	Encl. exist. porch with br. & c-block wall, build brick stairway. Install doors & windows. Bld. partition for powder rm.

ACTION: No obj., to parts visible from public space, 8/26/66.

34	3252 N St., NW Leo M. Bernstein	New door trim, 2 fanlight windows.

ACTION: Ret'd. for add'l. study of openings & more accurate drawings. Reduce entr. to single door, width of window above. Transom questionable in proposed location. Also question accuracy of large arched window 2nd fl. See notes on drawings, 8/26/66.

35	1400-35th St., NW Lt. Gen. Jos. Smith	New brick garage, slate roof.

ACTION: Ret'd. for restudy of roofing & more photos showing rear of house & encl'd. porch on east of garden. Question flashing condition resulting from gable roof. Suggest shed roof as a more reasonable solution, 8/26/66

36	3255 Prospect St., NW Becker Paint & Glass Co.	1 s-f, 20 sq-ft sign. Cast alum. ltrs. with flat white baked enamel finish to dark red brick over entr.

ACTION: Recom'd., 8/26/66.

NO OG 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
37	3261 K St., NW Hamilton Invest. Corp	Constr. brick machine shelter 9'-9" X 14'-3". Remove portion of exist. shed over driveway.
ACTION:	No obj. to brick machine shelter. Subm. more exact inf. on removal of exist. shed, 8/26/66.	
39	3234 N St., NW Mrs. Mladek	Ret. wall stucco finish.
ACTION:	No obj., 8/24/66.	

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS AUG 1 8 1966

NO OG 66-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
304	1250-37th St., NW Georgetown University	Georgetown U. Library

ACTION: Not recom'd. Combinsation of site & bldg. design do not meet the CFA's standards for this important area of the Washington landscape. See action on OG 66-257, 8/2/66.

310	3220 "O" St., NW Richard D. Sowder	2-story brick & frame store.

ACTION: General design OK. Suggest further study. Try using only 1 horizontal division on window over door. Make showwindow larger by dropping sill in the neighborhood of 1'. Eliminate heavy wood member on handrail, 8/8/66.

67-6	2515 P St., NW Froe Properties	Proposed aprtment bldg.

ACTION: Ret'd. for further study. Elements of facade still lacking in general composition & proportion. Re-study character of windows & doors with more emphasis on uniformity. Eliminate shutters & omit air-cond. units beneath window openings. Increase height of 1st fl. to approx. 12'. Request subm. of roof & plot plans in sketch form with next subm., 8/10/66.

20	3051 Q St., NW Mrs Francis Winslow	Remove porch & corrugated metal garages. Constr. carport, terraces, balconies & new steps.

ACTION: Ret'd. for study of lighter treatment of balconies & stairway with w-i or wood. Make effort to unify sash type to exist. 6/6 & 9/6. Restudy carport piers--suggest use of brick, 8/10/66.

21	1686-32nd St., NW Suzanne O. Kuser	Encl. exist. porch with brick & c-block walls. Build brick stairway.

ACTION: No obj. to encl. porch. Restudy & resubm. showing single door. Recom. a landing at top of entry stairs, 8/10/66.

NO OG 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
22	1621 Wisc. Ave., NW Helen McCauley	6' stockade (white cedar fence)
ACTION:	No obj., 8/10/66.	
23	1619 Suters Le., NW Gen & Mrs Oscar Senters	Remove exist. brick paving in yard & use same along inner edge of curb. Build seat wall in br. & c-block 1'-6" above terrace. Ext. flagstone paving to seat wall. Bld. conc. pool with recirculating pump, & add 4" of br. to br. wall for fountain.
ACTION:	No obj., 8/10/66.	
24	1027-33rd St., NW Helen Caton Zust Trust	Replace exist. wood windows & doors with new wood windows & doors.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 7/28/66.	
25	1656-32nd St., NW Barbara A. Rathe	Addn. of living rm. to rear of exist. house & entr. in front side yard.
ACTION:	Recom'd. Suggest using exist. door in new location, 8/10/66.	
26	1657 Wisc. Ave., NW Jas. F.&M. Margaret Linskey	Alter exist. bay window.
ACTION:	Recom'd., provided details of showwindow are subm'd. for app'l. Suggest surface planting area in front of showwindow be eliminated & possibility of using movable planting tubs be studied, 8/1/66.	
27	2524 Q St., NW Russell A. Eldridge	3-story brick dwelling.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 8/2/66.	

AUG 1 8 1966

NO OG 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
28	3291 M St., NW Elec. Util. Employees Union	Remodel 1st-fl. facade & repair brickwork on right side of facade full height of bldg. Details subm'd. per request of June 27 showing relation of windows & doors to bldg. line.

ACTION: Scale relation between 1st & 2nd fls. still unresolved.. Recom. further study particularly of doors & door height. Study possibility of strengthening cornice above 1st fl., 8/10/66.

29	1271 Wisc. Ave., NW Margaret A. Fisher	Install new gas lights flanking corner entr. to David's Village Shop Store.

ACTION: Resubmit showing relation of lights to proposed sign, 8/10/66.

30	1810-12 Wisc. Ave., NW A. L. Hutton, Inc.	Brick sample as requested.

ACTION: Sample submitted recom'd. provided buff color mortar is used, 8/10/66.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

JUL 2 9 1966

NO OG 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
9	3234 N St., NW J. V. Mladke	Ret. wall adjoin. property at 3234 & 3236 N St. Wall 3' high of solid masonry stuccoed & capped with 1" black Penna. slate.
ACTION:	Recom'd., provided that ret. wall be faced with brick to match exist. wall adjoining sidewalk, 7/19/66.	
10	3107 M St., NW Fred Astaire Studio	1 s-f, 22.6 sq-ft sign. Black metal ltrs. Illuminated.
ACTION:	Recom'd., provided sign cabinet be painted same color as stucco bckgd., 7/19/66.	
11	3116 P St., NW Gov. Leroy Collins	Repairs to exist. garden utility house.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 7/19/66.	
12	3046 N St., NW Rob't. & Lelia Lawrence	Install light outside of basem. door.
ACTION:	No obj. Suggest slightly larger lamp would be more suitable, 7/19/66.	
14	1264 Wisc. Ave., NW Wm. A. Martin	Move fan from kitchen to roof installing 18 gauge galvanized iron duct in chimney.
ACTION:	No obj., 7/19/66.	
15	3214 S St., NW John Wm. Warner	Raze in entirety frame bldg. on estate. Not condemned by D. C. Gov't.
ACTION:	No obj., 7/19/66.	

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS (Continued)

JUL 2 9 1966

NO OG 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
16	2723 Dumbarton St., NW Rob't. E. Hall	Build grape arbor at rear of property adjacent to exist. utility bldg.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 7/19/66.	
17	3125 "O" St., NW Rowland Evans	Constr. new room at rear of exist. residence.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 7/19/66.	
18	2001 Wisc. Ave., NW Richard J. Donohoe & Assoc.	Erect walks, steps, planter, fountains, etc.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 7/19/66.	
19	3300 Whitehaven St., NW	Same as OG 67-18.
13	1612 Wisc. Ave., NW George Mahoney	Aluminum siding over brick. Side & rear.
ACTION:	Not recom'd. Aluminum siding unsuitable. Recom. that brick wall be either repaired or, less preferable, that stucco be applied to brick face, JUL 2 9 1966	

JUL 19 1966

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

NO OG 66-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
278	3800 Reser. Rd., NW Georgetown U.	Addns. to Medical Center.

ACTION: Recom'd. for design concept incl. bay spacing, structural frame & general treatment. Request add'l. studies of fenestration & panel details within bays. Also request subm. of material samples for review, 6/22/66.

288	2723 N St., NW Homer W. Hanscom	New front stoop & new window sashes.

ACTION: No obj., provided exist. rail. & balusters are used & new brick is painted to match house & provided that all glass lights in windows be taller than wide. In this respect check dimensions of dormer & basem. windows, 6/27/66.

289	3301 "O" St., NW Richard Borwick	Raise height of exist. brick fence wall from 2 to 4' present levels to 6' maximum. No chg. in location of brick wall.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided new brickwork matches exist. exactly with respect to size, texture & color. Maintain rowlock at top of wall, 6/27/66.

290	2401 Q St., NW Maiatico, Lemm, & Robertson	Westmoreland Salem Picket Fence. 3' & 48" high.

ACTION: No obj., provided Salem Picket is used on all sides & iron fence is deleted. Stain fence dark brown, 6/30/66.

291	1660-34th St., NW Esther B. Davis	Install 2 new dormers & 2 d/h sash. for attic room & 1 sliding door.

ACTION: No obj., 6/27/66.

292	3255 Prospect St., NW Stanton Kolb	Air-cond. unit in side brick wall of new bldg.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Unit proposed projects too far from surface of bldg., JUL 19 1966

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS (Continued)

JUL 19 1966

NO OG 66-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
293	3233 Reservoir Rd., NW Carleton B. Swift, Jr.	Extension of exist. ret. walls.
ACTION: No obj. Suggest planting of ivy, etc., to soften wall on Reservoir Rd., 6/27/66.		
294	3233 Reser. Rd., NW Margaret McKindley	Remove roof on exist. front porch, leaving brick columns intact.
ACTION: No obj. to removing roof, but recom. that add'l. study be given to remaining structure & entryway, 6/27/66.		
295	2391 M St., NW Electric Utility Employees Union	Remodel facade of 1st. fl. & repair brickwork on right side of facade full height of bldg.
ACTION: No obj. to principle. Question scale difference between 1st & 2nd fls. Subm. plan of front of bldg. showing relation of windows & doors to bldg. line, 6/27/66.		
296	2714½ Poplar St., NW Mrs Prue Baxter	Fixture 14" long x 8" wide.
ACTION:: No obj., 6/30/66.		
297	3000 Q St., NW A. Manuel	Fixture 14" long x 8" wide.
ACTION: No obj., 6/30/66.		
298	2901 K St., NW Leory O. King	Erect on skids a premanufactured aggregate bin, painted gray.
ACTION: No obj., 6/27/66.		

NO OG 66-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
299	1056 Wisc. Ave., NW D. C. Gov't.	Street cleaning tool-house.
ACTION: No obj. to concept, but recm. restudy of gate to obtain a more suitable character. Also suggest restudy with cornice & parapet in place of standing seam roof, 6/21/66.		
300	3103 P St., NW Ralph Seward	6' basket weave fence.
ACTION: No obj., 6/27/66.		
301	1264 Wisc. Ave., NW Martin's Tavern	Move about 6' of old chimney, leaving 1' above roof. Install exhaust duct in chimney.
ACTION: Request add'l. inf. Show plan of duct across roof to exist. fan. Subm. photo of roof area, 6/27/66.		
302	1657 Wisc. Ave., NW Jas F & M. Linskey	Remove bay window & install new front.
ACTION: Restudy to retain exist. style, character & scale of bldg. Suggest study with exist. door & cornice over door & bay with large arched glass areas in exist. bay shape, 7/13/66.		
303	1516-18-20 Wisc. Ave., NW Thos. E. Mannix	Install 3 Prescolite Fixtures as indicated on enclosed draw. #5, dtd. 5/25/66-revised 6/17/66.
ACTION: Recm'd., 6/21/66.		
305	1219 Wisc. Ave., NW M.M. & N.W. Wise	Install fire escape. Painted same as bldg. to minimize visibility.
ACTION: No obj., provided fire escape is painted to match bldg., 6/27/66.		

NO OG 66-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
306	1810-12 Wisc. Ave., NW A. L. Hutton, Inc.	Replace 1st story c.b. walls with brick, add 2nd story to rear section of bldg. (facing 34th St.)
ACTION:	Recom'd., provided hexagonal window is eliminated. Subm. brick sample, 7/11/66.	
307	1611 Wisc. Ave., NW Randolph W. Reed, Jr.	Raze 3 car garage which is now exist. on rear of property.
ACTION:	No obj., 6/27/66.	
308	1075 Thos. Jeff. St., NW Thos. Jeff. House	Tempo. real est. sign. Single-faced, 24 sq-ft.
ACTION:	Recom'd., provided sign is mounted on side of constr. barricade for the duration of constr. only, 7/11/66.	
309	1651-34th St., NW Richard Grisler	6' wood stockade fence.
ACTION:	No obj., 7/11/66.	
311	1219-35th St., NW A.B. & R.M. Harper	Build wall with iron fence inset. Install 36" wide iron gate to patio. Change door-sample on drawings.
ACTION:	No obj., 7/11/66.	
312	1427 Wisc. Ave., NW Christ Child Society, Inc.	Addn. to rear of exist. bldg. which can be partially seen from P St.
ACTION:	No obj., Submit sample of brick, 7/11/66.	

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS (Continued)

JUL 19 1966

NO OG 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
1	1661-34th St., NW Mrs Vera Dickey	Close in exist. 1st fl. open porch & build roof overhang & sun deck.
ACTION:	No obj. to parts visible from public space, 7/11/66.	
2	2816 N St., NW Edward J. McGowen	Change windows rear 1st fl. Install French Doors rear ground fl.
ACTION:	No obj., 7/11/66.	
3	3256 M St., NW W. H. Brewton	Air-cond. unit to be installed on roof.
ACTION:	Recom'd., provided air-cond. units are painted neutral gray, 7/11/66.	
4	1719-21 Wisc. Ave., NW David Cooper	2-story masonry addn.
ACTION:	Restudy. Simplify door details & porch columns. Eliminate 45-degree angle wall of stairwall. Better $\frac{1}{4}$" drawings. More detail on lattice. Omit pediment over 1st fl. doorway. Omission of window in stairway. Center sign on bldg. Study proj. of fl. slab & balcony 6"-8" beyond surface of bldg. Also study breaking cornice line approx. 6"-8" to relate to balcony rail. Suggest simple w-i columns be substituted for cast stone, 7/13/66.	
5	1660-34th St., NW Mr & Mrs Edwin W. Davis	Addn. & repairs to exist. bldg.
ACTION:	No obj., 7/11/66.	

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS (Continued) JUL 19 1966

NO OG 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
7	2524 Q St., NW Russell A. Eldridge	New brick dwelling.
ACTION:	Not recom'd. See previous action--OG 66-235, JUL 22 1966	
8	1524-28th St., NW John Wainwright	6' high reed fence 55' long on land of owner. Also 15'-4' high on front of property (28th St.)
ACTION:	Recom'd., 7/8/66.	

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

JUN 24 1966

NO OG 66-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
257	1250-37th St., NW Georgetown University	Library Bldg. Modification of OG 66-189 & study of alternate site suggested by CFA.

ACTION: Disap'd. See attached ltr. dtd. 5/26/66 from Chairman William Walton to Julian P. Green, 5/26/66.

276	1365-67 Wisc. Ave., NW John W. Molyneaux	New 4" brick veneer at lst fl. to conceal prev. alterations. Chg. lst fl. entr. & wind's. Paint all trim; paint all brick except new veneer. Roof top a/c units. Screen wall on O St.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Suggest that new openings on lst fl. be aligned to upper windows. Recom. that small projection on the corner be eliminated. Object to use of painted upper brick & unpainted brick on lst fl. Suggest entire bldg. be painted the same color to achieve maximum unity, JUN 24 1966

277	1659-35th St., NW Basil C. Gogos	Revised drawings of window & 2 light fixtures.

ACTION: No obj. to window which, it is noted, is already in place. Recom. that fake oil reservoir on proposed carriage lamps be omitted, 6/10/66.

279	1225 Wisc. Ave., NW Tivoli Restaurant	1 s-f, 24 sq-ft sign flat against bldg.

ACTION: No obj., 6/8/66.

280	1271 Wisc. Ave., NW M. A. Fisher (Commercial)	Remove exist. bow window at corner & replace with door & frame where there once was a previous corner entr.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided a more simple paneled door be substituted for proposed. Also request better description of overhead lighting fixture, 6/7/66.

281	1516-18-20 Wisc. Ave., NW Rich's Shoe Store	Alterations to front & back.

ACTION: Recom'd., 6/2/66.

NO OG 66-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
282	1719-21 Wisc. Ave., NW David Cooper	Addn. of 2nd fl. on top of exist. 1-story bldg.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Restudy relation & alighment to exist. structure & simplify gallery elements, JUN 24 1966

283	3425 M St., NW Ed Miller (Store)	Raze 1-story masonry store bldg. in entirety. Not condemned by D. C. Gov't.

ACTION: No obj., 6/7/66.

284	2515 P St., NW Froe Properties	Informal revised drawings to OG 66-247.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Restudy to simplify number of elements. Eliminate upper terrace railings & shutters. Try brick window heads. Make living rm., balcony doors more harmonious with window openings. Beige brick inappropriate, JUN 24 1966

285	2816 N St., NW Edward J. McGowen	Alterations to front & rear.

ACTION: No obj., provided 1st fl. air-cond. is located on front or opposite side of bay rather than over entry stair, 6/8/66.

287	1515 Wisc. Ave., NW Belle M. Johnson (Commercial)	Recess exist. entr. door in vestibule.

ACTION: No obj., 6/8/66.

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. J. RES. 1232

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 26, 1966

Mr. SCHEUER introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works

JOINT RESOLUTION

To provide for the formulation, adoption, administration, and periodic updating of a comprehensive development plan for the United States Capitol Grounds and contiguous related and influencing areas.

Whereas the immediate vicinity of the National Capitol Building is the seat of the legislative and judicial branches of the Federal Government; and

Whereas Washington, District of Columbia, was originally carefully planned as an attractive city with facilities which for many years thereafter were adequate for the efficient functioning of the said branches of Government and of personnel associated therewith and interested therein and for the related movements of residents of and visitors to the Nation's Capital; and

Exhibit G

Whereas as the city has grown in population, various supplemental plans have been developed from time to time for the city as a whole and for individual portions thereof; and

Whereas the present population of the city far exceeds that of any time in the past and will undoubtedly continue to expand; and

Whereas the functions of the legislative and judicial branches of Government and the number of persons associated therewith have likewise expanded greatly beyond the concepts of the initial planning process; and

Whereas the number of citizens who annually visit the Nation's Capital has increased to approximately seven million and is anticipated to continue to increase in future years; and

Whereas it is in the national interest that the United States Capitol Grounds and the contiguous related and influencing areas be developed and maintained so as to facilitate functions of the legislative and judicial branches of Government, the access and egress of persons associated therewith, the existence at all times of an attractive and esthetic environment appropriate to the seat of the legislative and judicial branches of Government, of which all Americans can justly be proud, and which interested citizens will desire to visit and will find pleasure in doing so; and

Whereas the environs of the Capitol include many houses and other buildings of historical and esthetic importance whose preservation will contribute to the beauty and distinction of the Capital City and the Capitol Grounds;

Whereas, in order that such grounds and areas be so developed and maintained it is necessary that a long-range comprehensive development plan be formulated, adopted, continually

administered and periodically updated to reflect future and presently unpredictable growth and changes in environment, circumstances, and needs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Architect of the Capitol, in consultation with the Commission on Architecture and Planning for the Capitol, is hereby authorized and directed to enter into a contract on behalf of the United States with an architecture and planning firm of national reputation which would have a working office within the Washington metropolitan area to assure thorough and neeessary liaison and properly qualified in all phases of the formulation of their comprehensive development plan including but not limited to experienee in related factors such as growth trends, socioeconomic factors, traffic flow and terminal facilities, costs and economic feasibility, civic center and park and open space developments, cultural, esthetic, and historie considerations, controls imposed by subsurfaee conditions, design, operation and maintenance of public faeilities, colleetion, eodification and use of data related to planning procedures previously prescribed by the Congress for urban areas, the preparation of factual and illustrated descriptive prospectuses and reports, and similar funetions essential to the formulation of an adequate and realistic comprehensive development plan,

under which such architecture and planning firm will conduct a full and complete study and analysis of the present and anticipated future development needs of the United States Capitol Grounds (as described in the Act of July 31, 1946, as amended (40 U.S.C. 193a)) and the contiguous and related influencing areas, and, on the basis of such study and analysis, will prepare a comprehensive and detailed plan for the suitable development (over the next twenty years) of such grounds and areas. In preparing such comprehensive development plan, due consideration shall be given to population growth of the Washington metropolitan area, growth of the staffs which daily work in such grounds and their needs for access and egress, facilities required for the convenience of visitors to the grounds, buildings (their occupancy, use and services), considerations of accessibility to and intercommunication between buildings and grounds, open green areas, priorities, relocations resulting from developments and all items hereinbefore mentioned as essential to the formulation of an adequate and realistic comprehensive development plan. During the course of its work, the architecture and planning firm shall maintain close liaison with the Architect of the Capitol, the appropriate committees of the Congress, the Commission on Architecture and Design for the Capitol, the National Capital Planning Commission, the National

Commission of Fine Arts, and other local agencies associated with the planning process. A preliminary draft of the report to contain the findings and recommendations of the architecture and planning firm shall be submitted in sixty copies not later than nine months after the firm has been notified to proceed with the work for the review and comment of the Architect of the Capitol, the Commission on Architecture and Planning for the Capitol, the appropriate committees of the Congress, the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Commission of Fine Arts, and other local agencies associated with the planning process, and within three months after the architecture and planning firm has been provided with such comments, it shall provide to the Architect of the Capitol and the Commission on Architecture and Design for the Capitol one thousand copies of a printed report, properly illustrated in color, defining the recommended comprehensive development plan, outlining the actions required for its implementation, and containing a schedule of appropriations estimated to be required therefor.

SEC. 2. The contract referred to in the first section shall not be entered into until after the approval of the terms and conditions thereof by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, nor shall the plan referred to in the first

section become the approved comprehensive development plan until appropriate action has been taken by such committees.

SEC. 3. Inasmuch as a projected comprehensive development plan must be modified from time to time to give proper recognition to future developments as they occur and which cannot necessarily be fully anticipated, the Architect of the Capitol in consultation with the Commission on Architecture and Design for the Capitol, is hereby authorized and directed to enter into a contract for the review of the approved comprehensive development plan at intervals not greater than five years and to submit the results of such review to the committees and other agencies mentioned in section 2 for appropriate consideration. Such periodic reviews should be made under contract with the same architecture and planning firm which prepared the original comprehensive development plan unless circumstances indicate otherwise.

SEC. 4. Inasmuch as the successful implementation of the plan requires that the buildings erected by the United States be of the highest architectural and design quality, the selection of the architects for such buildings shall be made from a panel of no less than ten architecture and planning firms of proven excellence of accomplishment which shall be submitted to the Architect of the Capitol by the Commission on Architecture and Planning for the Capitol.

SEC. 5. There is authorized to be appropriated such amount as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of section 1.

SEC. 6. No project which would increase the size of the National Capitol Building, or modify such building in any substantial manner, shall be carried out unless the plans for such project have been approved by the Commission on Architecture and Planning for the Capitol.

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. J. RES. 1232

JOINT RESOLUTION

To provide for the formulation, adoption, administration, and periodic updating of a comprehensive development plan for the United States Capitol Grounds and contiguous related and influencing areas.

By Mr. SCHEUER

JULY 26, 1966
Referred to the Committee on Public Works

SUBCOMMITTEE ON
BUSINESS AND COMMERCE

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 14205

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 10, 1966

Read twice and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia

AN ACT

To declare the Old Georgetown Market a historic landmark and to require its preservation and continued use as a public market, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the real property, together with all structures thereon on the date of enactment of this Act, described as lot 800, square 1186, of the District of Columbia, commonly known as the Old Georgetown Market, is hereby declared a historic landmark, and the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to preserve such property as a historic landmark and to operate and maintain it as a public market, except that the Board is authorized to enter

Exhibit H'

into an agreement with the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the use of a portion of such property as a museum to be operated by the Secretary in connection with the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. Such property shall not be used under authority of any provision of law for any purpose not provided in this Act, unless (1) such law is enacted after the date of enactment of this Act and (2) specifically authorizes such property to be used for such other purpose.

Passed the House of Representatives May 9, 1966.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 14205

AN ACT

To declare the Old Georgetown Market a historic landmark and to require its preservation and continued use as a public market, and for other purposes.

MAY 10, 1966

Read twice and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia

NOTED
MAY 31 1966
RECEIVED
THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON, D. C.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

WILLIAM WALTON, Chairman
GORDON BUNSHAFT ALINE B. SAARINEN
BURNHAM KELLY HIDEO SASAKI
THEODORE ROSZAK JOHN CARL WARNECKE
CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

1 June 1966

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON

Dear Senator Bible:

This is in reply to a request received on May 31st, 1966, for a report on H.R. 14205, "An Act to declare the Old Georgetown Market a historic landmark and to require its preservation and continued use as a public market, and for other purposes."

The Commission of Fine Arts endorses the principles of H.R. 14205 and recommends that the Old Georgetown Market be restored to its original form and use.

As you know, the 1950 Congress passed Public Law 808, the Old Georgetown Act, which provided for the preservation of the historic character of this area. Restoration of the Old Georgetown Market is particularly fitting since it is an authentic example of architecture in the early years of the National Capital.

The building is over one hundred years old and qualifies in every respect for preservation. Structures from this period of Washington's history are few in number and there is a continuing threat of demolition. Several years ago, for example, there was a move to clear the Old Georgetown Market site for a parking lot. We feel that legislation to prevent this type of loss is essential.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton

William Walton
Chairman

Honorable Alan Bible
Chairman
Committee on the District of Columbia
United States Senate
Washington, D. C.

Exhibit D-2

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 12119

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 18, 1966

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia

A BILL

To authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to reconstruct the substructure and to replace the superstructure of the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to reconstruct the existing substructure of the Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, including the removal, repair, and modification of existing piers, and the complete reconstruction of the bridge superstructure.

SEC. 2. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia

Exhibit I

are hereby authorized to construct bridge approaches and roads connecting such bridge and approaches with streets and park roads in the District of Columbia and with roads and park roads on the Virginia side of the Potomac River: *Provided*, That the authorization contained in this section shall not apply to any bridge approaches and connecting roads extending beyond the boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia, as defined in section 101 of Public Law 208, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved October 31, 1945.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such District of Columbia funds as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 12119

A BILL

To authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to reconstruct the substructure and to replace the superstructure of the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia

JANUARY 18, 1966
Referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 17124

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 17, 1966

Mr. WHITENER (by request) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia

A BILL

To authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to to lease airspace in freeway rights-of-way within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Freeway Airspace Utilization Act."

SEC. 2. When used in this Act—

"Airspace" means so much of the space above, on, and below freeway rights-of-way as is not needed for freeway purposes.

"Commissioners" means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

I

Exhibit J

"District" means the District of Columbia.

"Freeway" means any limited access divided highway within the District.

"Right-of-way" means land, property, or interest therein acquired for or devoted to a freeway, including connecting ramps.

"United States" means the Government of the United States or any department or agency thereof, including, without limitation, any agency established or authorized to be established by Act of Congress or by interstate compact to which consent of Congress is given.

SEC. 3. The Commissioners are hereby authorized:

(a) to make or permit such use of airspace in the District for any municipal purpose, including, without limitation, housing for low-income families, public welfare, public works, park, recreational, and vehicle parking, as will not be detrimental to or impair the efficient use, operation, and maintenance of any freeway;

(b) to enter into contracts or agreements with the United States for the use of airspace and for the purpose of receiving, or qualifying any permittee or lessee to receive, grants or other financial assistance under available Federal programs in connection with the construc-

tion, use, or operation of buildings, structures and other things therein;

(c) to enter into agreements with the United States for the granting to the United States of easements to use airspace for the purpose of constructing therein Federal public buildings and for such other purposes as may be agreed upon. Such easements shall, for the purpose of section 355 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), be deemed sufficient and valid title in the United States in the areas in which are to be constructed public buildings or other facilities; and

(d) to enter into leases of, or grant revocable permits for, the use of airspace in the District, including rights of or for support, access, utilities, light, and air to an extent not inconsistent with the use of a freeway by the general public for the purpose of travel, and, in connection with any such lease or permit, to impose such terms and conditions including, but not limited to, the deposit of bond or other security, and to provide for the payment of such rents or fees as the Commissioners may, in their discretion, determine to be necessary or desirable, but the Commissioners may, in connection with the entry into a lease, or the granting of

a permit, for the use of such airspace, provide as conditions of any such lease or permit (1) that such airspace shall not be used by the lessee or permittee in such manner as to deprive of its easements of light, air, and access any real property not owned or controlled by such lessee or permittee, and (2) that upon the expiration of the lease or permit and of any renewal thereof, any building or other structure which may have been constructed in such airspace shall, at the direction of the Commissioners, be removed therefrom by and at the expense of the lessee or permittee or his successor in interest, and the airspace shall be restored to the condition which obtained prior to the construction of such building or other structure, all to the satisfaction of the Commissioners.

SEC. 4. (a) The authority contained in section 3 shall be exercised by the Commissioners in furtherance of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital prepared pursuant to the National Capital Planning Act of 1952 (40 U.S.C. 71) and in the following order of priority—

(1) The Commissioners shall determine whether such space is required for a municipal purpose, as authorized by subsection (a) of section 3, and if they determine the space is so required, they are authorized to make such use of it.

(2) The Commissioners shall ascertain, through the Executive Director of the National Capital Housing Authority established by the Act approved June 12, 1934 (48 Stat. 930), whether such space is required for the construction thereof of dwellings for low-income families at rents in accordance with their incomes, and if the Commissioners find that such space is so required they are authorized, with or without charge, to make it available for such construction by granting an easement to use such space, and such easement shall constitute sufficient and valid title in the Authority or in the United States, or in any private developer under contract to convey the completed property to the Authority, as the case may be, to construct therein buildings or other facilities. The use of such space by the Authority shall be subject to such agreement as the Authority has entered into with the District respecting the making of payments in lieu of taxes.

(3) The Commissioners shall ascertain, through the Administrator, General Services Administration, whether the United States (other than the National Capital Housing Authority) requires such space for the construction therein of a building, other structure, or facility, and if such space is so required, the Commissioners are authorized to make it available without charge to the

United States, or on the basis of such charge as may be agreed upon between the Commissioners and the United States.

(4) The Commissioners shall determine whether such space should be leased to a public or private developer to provide housing for low- and moderate-income individuals and families, and if the Commissioners so determine, they may include in such lease, or make such permit subject to, an agreement whereby a preference in admission to the housing will be given to low- and moderate-income individuals and families displaced by urban activities or as a result of other governmental action.

(5) The Commissioners shall determine whether the space should be leased to a non-profit organization, such as a hospital, welfare agency, or the like, for the construction therein of a building, other structure, or facility to be used in connection with the activities of such organization.

(6) The Commissioners shall determine whether such space should be made available for business purposes, including, without limitation, housing for individuals and families.

(b) In connection with the lease of such space either for housing for low- and moderate-income families and fami-

lies displaced from urban renewal areas or as a result of governmental action, or for use by nonprofit organizations or for business purposes, the Commissioners are authorized to lease the space either on the basis of competitive bids or on a negotiated basis, as the Commissioners determine is in the best interests of the District and of the general public.

SEC. 5. For the purposes of this Act, airspace, and buildings, structures, and improvements constructed or erected within such airspace, pursuant to a lease or permit, shall be deemed to be real property and be liable to assessment and taxation as such from the beginning of the term or period of such lease or permit. For the purposes of real property assessment and taxation, the value of such airspace, other than any building, structure, or improvement constructed or erected therein, shall be deemed to be the value of the underlying land as if the same were not occupied and used for public purposes. No such tax shall be assessed with respect to any airspace and buildings, structures, and improvements therein (1) for which the United States has been granted an easement (but nothing herein contained shall be construed to abrogate such agreement as the United States may have entered into, or may enter into, with the District with respect to making payments in lieu of real property taxes) or used for the purposes specified in subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of this Act; or (2)

occupied and used by one or more organizations exclusively for a purpose or for purposes which, under section 1 of the Act of December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1089), as amended (sec. 47–801a, D.C. Code), would entitle real property so occupied and used to be exempt from taxation. Except as otherwise provided in this section, for the purposes of this Act the provisions of law applicable to special assessments for public improvements, and the provisions of law applicable to sanitary sewer service charges and to water service charges, shall be applicable with respect to airspace and buildings, structures, and improvements therein used pursuant to a lease entered into with, or permit granted to, a lessee or permittee under the authority of subsection (d) of section 3 of this Act. The leasehold or permit interest in any airspace so leased or granted, including any building, structure or improvement constructed or erected therein, shall, in cases of nonpayment of real property taxes, nonpayment of special assessments for public improvements, and nonpayment of sanitary sewer service or water service charges, be subject to private, outright sale by the District, without any right in the lessee or permittee to redeem the leasehold or permit interest so sold: *Provided*, That the proceeds from such sale in excess of such delinquent taxes, assessments, or charges, or a combination thereof, including any interest, penalties, and costs relating thereto, shall be

paid by the District to the lessee or permittee, or to such person as he may, in writing, designate.

SEC. 6. (a) Prior to the entry by the Commissioners into any agreement or lease, or their granting of any permit for the use of airspace, the following actions shall be taken:

(1) The Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia, after public hearing, shall have determined the use to be permitted in such airspace and shall have promulgated regulations pertaining thereto, including but not limited to, limitations and requirements respecting the height of any structure to be erected in such space, off-street parking and floor area ratio, which limitations and requirements need not be the same as those provided for properties not within airspace. The provisions of section 10 of the Act entitled "An Act Providing for the zoning of the District of Columbia and the regulation of the location, height, bulk, and uses of buildings and other structures and of the use of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved June 20, 1938 (52 Stat. 800; § 5–422, D.C. Code), shall be applicable to regulations made pursuant to this section and to violations of such regulations.

(2) The lessee or permittee shall have submitted to the Commissioners and the Zoning Commission for their

review and approval, plans, elevations, sections, and a scale model for any structure to be erected in such airspace, and a description of the texture, material, and method of construction of exterior walls.

(b) (1) The provisions of section 16 of the Act approved June 20, 1938 (52 Stat. 802), as amended (§ 5–428, D.C. Code), shall be applicable to the construction of federal public buildings in like manner as if the buildings were constructed entirely on property owned by the United States, and, to the extent that such section is, by subsection 5(c) of the National Capital Planning Act of 1952, as amended (40 U.S.C. § 71d(c)), made applicable thereto, such section 16 shall also be applicable to the construction by the District of Columbia of any building.

(2) Plans for construction in airspace by the Federal or District Governments shall be subject to consultation, advice and recommendation of the National Capital Planning Commission in accordance with the National Capital Planning Act of 1952, as amended (40 U.S.C. sec. 71 et seq.).

(3) Plans for construction in airspace shall be subject to review and recommendation of the Commission of Fine Arts to the extent required by, and in accordance with, the Act approved May 16, 1930 (46 Stat. 366), as amended (§§ 5–410 and 411, D.C. Code), the Act ap-

proved September 22, 1950 (64 Stat. 903; title 5, chapter 8, D.C. Code), and Executive Orders dated October 25, 1910 and November 28, 1913.

(c) Whenever the Commissioners shall find that there is any significant change in, or substantial modification of, the plans for the proposed structure after such plans have been approved in accordance with the requirements of the preceding subsections of this section and of section 3, or if, after the construction of the structure, they find there is any significant change in, or substantial modification of, the structure or the use made of it, each such change or modification shall be subject to approval by the agencies specified in this section, as their interests may appear, in like manner as is set forth in subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

SEC. 7. The cost of removing or relocating publicly-owned and privately-owned facilities in a street, highway, or alley, including, without limitation, water lines and sewers, to the extent that any such removal or relocation is required in connection with the construction of a building in airspace under the authority of this Act, other than a building constructed by or on behalf of the District, shall not be borne by the District, but the cost of any such removal or relocation shall be defrayed by another or by others than the District in accordance with such arrangements as may be acceptable to the Commissioners and be approved by them

in writing. The removal or relocation by the District of sewers and watermains, and the removal or relocation of any other facilities in such space, shall be in accordance with plans and schedules approved by the Commissioners.

SEC. 8. Except as provided in section 6, laws and regulations now or hereafter in effect in the District and applicable to the construction, use, and occupancy of buildings and premises, including, but not limited to, building, electrical, plumbing, housing, health, and fire regulations, shall be applicable to buildings, structures, and improvements erected in airspace under lease or agreement entered into or permit issued pursuant to this Act, except to the extent that the Commissioners by order or regulation make them inapplicable.

SEC. 9. (a) The Commissioners are authorized, after public hearing, to promulgate regulations to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) Any regulations adopted under the authority of this section may provide for the imposition of a fine of not more than $300 or imprisonment for not more than ninety days, or both such fine and imprisonment, for any violation of such regulations. Prosecutions for violations of regulations made pursuant to this section shall be conducted in the name of the District by the Corporation Counsel or any of his assistants.

(c) Whenever there exists any violation or failure to comply with regulations adopted under the authority of this Act, or regulations specified in section 8 of this Act, after notice of such violation or failure has been given by the Commissioners, each and every day such violation exists, or each and every day beyond a time limit set for compliance during which there is failure to comply fully with any of the said regulations or with orders issued pursuant to the authority contained therein, shall constitute a separate offense, and the penalty specified for the violation of such regulation shall be applicable to each such separate offense.

SEC. 10. All collections, including rents and fees, received by the District pursuant to this Act shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States in a trust fund which is hereby authorized and from which may be paid, in the same manner as is provided by law for other expenditures of the District, such expenditures as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, including, without limitation, necessary expenses connected with the operation, maintenance, and disposition of property coming into the possession of the District by reason of default under leases entered into or permits issued pursuant to this Act: *Provided*, That taxes (including payments in lieu of taxes), special assessments, and sanitary sewer and water service charges shall be de-

posited directly to the respective funds to which such revenues are normally deposited. The unobligated balance in such trust fund as of June 30 of any year which exceeds $100,000 shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of such special funds or the general fund of the District in such proportions as the Commissioners shall, in their discretion determine.

SEC. 11. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be delegated by the Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

SEC. 12. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as modifying or superseding Title 23, United States Code: *Provided,* That the use of public space under the authority of this Act shall not be deemed to deprive the District of its eligibility for financial assistance under any federally-assisted program, regardless of the fact that the District may, in the case of privately-owned building, receive rental for the use of such public space.

SEC. 13. No use shall be made under the authority of this Act of any airspace within the right-of-way of a free-

way within, or abutting upon, the United States Capitol Grounds except upon approval of the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol.

SEC. 14. If any provision of this Act or of the regulations promulgated under the authority of this Act is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions either of this Act or of the said regulations which can be effected without the invalid provision, and to this end the provisions of this Act and the said regulations are separable.

SEC. 15. Appropriations to carry out the purposes of this Act are hereby authorized.

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 17124

A BILL

To authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to lease airspace in freeway rights-of-way within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

By Mr. WHITENER

AUGUST 17, 1966

Referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. J. RES. 116

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 9, 1966

Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

JOINT RESOLUTION

To provide for the administration and development of Pennsylvania Avenue as a national historic site.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby finds and determines—

(a) that it is in the national interest that Pennsylvania Avenue and the area adjacent to it between the Capitol and the White House be developed, used, and maintained in a manner suitable to its ceremonial, historical, and physical relationship to the executive and legislative branches of the Government; and

(b) that the work of reviewing, programing, and coordinating proposals for the proper development, use,

Exhibit K

and control of Pennsylvania Avenue and the area adjacent to it between the Capitol and the White House should be continued, with the maximum possible use of private enterprise in carrying out the development plan.

SEC. 2. The designation on September 30, 1965, by the Secretary of the Interior of Pennsylvania Avenue between the Capitol and the White House and certain areas adjacent thereto as a national historic site under the name "The Pennsylvania Avenue National Historic Site" is hereby ratified and confirmed. The boundaries of said historic site are as follows:

beginning at a point on the southwest corner of the intersection of Fifteenth Street and Constitution Avenue Northwest, easterly along the south side of Constitution Avenue to the southwest corner of the intersection of Constitution Avenue and Pennsylvania Avenue;

then easterly along the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue to and including the outer circumference of First Street Northwest which forms an arc around Peace Monument;

then westerly along the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue to the northeast corner of the intersection of Third Street and Pennsylvania Avenue Northwest;

then northerly along the east side of Third Street to

the northeast corner of the intersection of Third Street and E Street Northwest;

then westerly along the north side of E Street to the northeast corner of the intersection of E Street and Fourth Street Northwest;

then northerly along the east side of Fourth Street to the northeast corner of the intersection of Fourth Street and G Street Northwest;

then westerly along the north side of G Street Northwest to the northwest corner of the intersection of G Street and Fifth Street Northwest;

then southerly along the west side of Fifth Street to the northwest corner of the intersection of Fifth Street and E Street Northwest;

then westerly along the north side of E Street to the northeast corner of the intersection of E Street and Seventh Street Northwest;

then northerly along the east side of Seventh Street to the point on Seventh Street being the intersection of the north side of G Street with the east side of Seventh Street Northwest;

then westerly from that point along the north side of G Street to the point being the intersection of the

north side of G Street with the west side of Ninth Street Northwest;

then southerly from that point along the west side of Ninth Street Northwest to the northwest corner of the intersection of Ninth Street and F Street Northwest;

then westerly along the north side of F Street to the northeast corner of the intersection of F Street and Eleventh Street Northwest;

then southerly along the east side of Eleventh Street to the northeast corner of the intersection of Eleventh Street and E Street Northwest;

then westerly along the north side of E Street to a point approximating what would be the northeast corner of E Street and Thirteen and a Half Street if the latter were extended north across Pennsylvania Avenue;

then northerly from the point along a line forming a perpendicular to F Street to the intersection of said line with the north side of F Street;

then westerly along the north side of F Street to the northeast corner of the intersection of F Street and Fifteenth Street Northwest;

then northerly along the east side of Fifteenth Street to the southeast corner of the intersection of

Fifteenth Street, New York Avenue, and Pennsylvania Avenue Northwest;

then westerly along the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue to the southwest corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and East Executive Avenue;

then southerly along the west side of East Executive Avenue to a point which would be the southwest corner of the intersection of East Executive Avenue and E Street;

then easterly along the south side of E Street to the southwest corner of the intersection of E Street and Fifteenth Street Northwest;

then southerly along the west side of Fifteenth Street to the point or place of beginning.

SEC. 3. There is hereby established a Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue (hereinafter referred to as "the Commission"), which shall be composed of (a) not more than seven members appointed by the President who are not officers or employees of the executive branch of the United States Government or of the government of the District of Columbia and who, in the judgment of the President, are especially qualified to serve thereon by virtue of their knowledge and experience in one or more of the fields of history,

architecture, city planning, and government, and (b) the following Government officials: the Secretaries of the Interior, Treasury, Commerce, and Housing and Urban Development, the Attorney General, the Administrator of the General Services Administration, the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, the Architect of the Capitol, the Chairmen of the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission, and the Director of the National Gallery of Art. One of the members shall be designated by the President as Chairman of the Commission.

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission shall review and refine the development plans heretofore prepared for Pennsylvania Avenue and the area within the Pennsylvania Avenue National Historic Site; shall from time to time, in consultation with other interested agencies of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia, make such modifications therein as may be necessary; shall coordinate the plans, programs, and activities of agencies of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia which affect the area within the said national historic site; and shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that such plans, programs, and activities are not inconsistent with plans developed for the said national historic site, the comprehensive plan for the National Capital, and any other related plans prepared or

developed by the National Capital Planning Commission or other appropriate authority.

(b) In addition to consulting with agencies of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia, the Commission shall consider the views of other public, quasi-public, and private organizations having a proper interest in the Pennsylvania Avenue area. The Commission shall also consider the views of owners and occupants of private property whose interests may be affected by any plans, programs, or actions of the Commission or the agencies whose activities are coordinated by the Commission and, for this purpose, shall, to the extent it deems feasible, conduct public hearings on those plans, programs, and activities. The Commission shall make every effort to minimize any harmful effects of such plans, programs, or activities on owners or occupants of private property in or adjoining the area affected thereby.

(c) The Commission, in carrying out its functions, shall utilize the services and facilities of other agencies of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia to the maximum extent possible. Financial and administrative services (including those related to budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement) shall be provided the Commission by the Department of the Interior, for which payment shall be made in advance, or by reim-

bursement, from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Chairman of the Commission and the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided,* That the regulations of the Department of the Interior for the collection of indebtedness of personnel resulting from erroneous payments (5 U.S.C. 46e) shall apply to the collection of erroneous payments made to or on behalf of a Commission employee, and regulations of said Secretary for the administrative control of funds (31 U.S.C. 665(G)) shall apply to appropriations of the Commission: *Provided further,* That the Commission shall not be required to prescribe such regulations.

(d) The Commission shall report to the President and the Congress annually and shall make such other reports as the President shall direct or as the Commission shall deem desirable. Such reports shall include recommendations for such further legislation as the Commission may consider appropriate for the proper performance of its functions or for the development of the national historic site in other respects.

(e) The Commission shall present a final report to the President and the Congress not later than July 1, 1971, and shall thereafter cease to exist. All of its records and papers shall thereupon be turned over to the custody of the Secretary of the Interior for his use and for proper disposition.

SEC. 5. (a) No agency of the Federal Government or of the District of Columbia shall conduct, consent to, or approve any project or program (1) relating to urban renewal, land redevelopment, or public housing within the area of the Pennsylvania Avenue National Historic Site, or (2) involving permanent construction, improvements, or facilities of a type designed to change the character of said area, without the approval of the Commission while it is in existence: *Provided*, That this prohibition shall not be effective if the President, notwithstanding the views of the Commission, shall approve such project or program: *Provided further*, That this section shall not be applicable to land under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol.

(b) During the three years immediately following the Commission's submission of its final report, no agency of the Federal Government or of the District of Columbia shall conduct, approve, or consent to any project or program of the types described in subsection (a) of this section which, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, is inconsistent with the development of the area within the Pennsylvania Avenue National Historic Site proposed in said final report unless, before the expiration of said three-year period, the plans therein proposed are disapproved by Act of Congress

or are modified by such Act, and in the latter case the project or program may be conducted, approved, or consented to only if it is not inconsistent with the plans as so modified.

SEC. 6. (a) Members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the Federal Government or of the District of Columbia government shall receive no additional compensation by virtue of membership on the Commission. Other members of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of not to exceed $100 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties for the Commission. Each member of the Commission shall be reimbursed, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2), for travel and subsistence and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of his duties for the Commission.

(b) The Commission is authorized to employ such personnel as may be required for the performance of its functions, and may procure the services of experts and consultants by contract or otherwise, but at rates not in excess of $100 per diem for individuals.

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, but not more than $800,000 in all, as may be

necessary for the Commission to carry out the duties and responsibilities imposed on it by this Act.

Passed the Senate June 8, 1966.

Attest: EMERY L. FRAZIER,

Secretary.

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. J. RES. 116

JOINT RESOLUTION

To provide for the administration and development of Pennsylvania Avenue as a national historic site.

JUNE 9, 1966

Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

NOTED

RECEIVED
THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON, D. C.
JUL 7 1966

89TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. J. RES. 119

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER 19, 1965

Mr. SIMPSON (for himself, Mr. DODD, and Mr. LAUSCHE) introduced the following joint resolution; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration

JOINT RESOLUTION

Authorizing the Hungarian Freedom Fighters' Federation to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs.

Whereas the Congress and the people of these United States are sympathetic toward the efforts of the people of Hungary to become free of the chains of Communist totalitarianism; and

Whereas we in America are reminded of our commitment to the purpose of the Hungarian revolution by the presence of nearly fifty thousand refugees from that revolution within our borders; and

Whereas we are mindful of the memories of the more than twenty-four thousand Hungarian freedom fighters who died in their valiant attempt to win freedom in the fall of 1956, and of countless thousands of other human beings who were

Exhibit L

jailed or deported by Soviet forces which overran Hungary and foiled her revolt against communism; and

Whereas we have stark evidence that, despite claims of Hungarian Communists to the contrary, not one of the goals of human freedom which the Hungarian nation fought for in 1956 have been realized—evidence that is well illustrated by the curtain of barbed wire which today surrounds Hungary, in plain view of the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the year 1966 will mark the tenth anniversary of the defeat of the valiant freedom fighters of Hungary by the brutal power of the Soviet Army: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Hungarian Freedom Fighters' Federation is authorized to erect a memorial on public grounds in the District of Columbia, or its environs, in honor and commemoration of the men and women of Hungary who fought so bravely ten years ago to win the rights and privileges of self-government.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to select, with the approval of the National Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission, a suitable site on public grounds in the District of Columbia, or its environs, upon which may be erected the memorial authorized in the first section of this Act: *Provided,* That if the site selected is on public grounds

belonging to or under jurisdiction of the government of the District of Columbia, the approval of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall also be obtained.

(b) The design and plans for such memorial shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the National Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Capital Planning Commission, and the United States or the District of Columbia shall be put to no expense in the erection thereof.

SEC. 3. The authority conferred pursuant to this joint resolution shall lapse unless (1) the erection of such memorial is commenced within two years from the date of enactment of this joint resolution, and (2) prior to its commencement funds are certified available in an amount sufficient, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, to insure completion of the memorial.

SEC. 4. The maintenance and care of the memorial enacted under the provisions of this Act shall be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior.

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 3398

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 25, 1966

Mr. CARLSON (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

A BILL

To provide for the installation of an eternal flame at the site of the Tomb of the Unknowns in Arlington National Cemetery.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to install and maintain at the site of the Tomb of the Unknowns at the Memorial Amphitheater in Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Virginia, a flame which shall be kept forever burning as a symbol of the Nation's

Exhibit M

undying gratitude to the members of its Armed Forces who gave their lives that freedom might endure.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no facility to provide a flame as a memorial at the site of any grave or tomb shall be installed at any other place in such cemetery after the date of enactment of this Act unless specifically authorized by the Congress, but the foregoing shall not apply in the case of any memorial flame heretofore established in such cemetery.

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 3398

A BILL

To provide for the installation of an eternal flame at the site of the Tomb of the Unknowns in Arlington National Cemetery.

By Mr. CARLSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota

MAY 25, 1966

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 3521

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 16, 1966

Mr. MUSKIE (for himself, Mr. HART, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YARBOROUGH) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Public Works

A BILL

To foster high standards of architectural excellence in the design and decoration of Federal public buildings outside the District of Columbia, and to provide a program for the acquisition and preservation of works of art for such buildings, and for other purposes, to be known as the Federal Fine Arts and Architecture Act.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is hereby declared to be the purpose of this Act to provide—

(1) for the maintenance of high standards of architectural design and art for public buildings outside the District of Columbia; and

Exhibit N

(2) a program for the acquisition and preservation of suitable works of art for public buildings outside the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of General Services.

(b) The term "public building" shall have the same meaning as is provided in section 13 (1) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959.

SEC. 3. (a) The Architectural Advisory Board is hereby established in the General Services Administration. The Chairman of the Board shall be the Assistant Commissioner of Design of the General Services Administration, ex officio. There shall be six other members of the Board each of whom shall be appointed by the Administrator to serve for a term expiring during one of the first three calendar years succeeding the year in which he is appointed, as designated by the Administrator at the time of appointment, subject to the limitation that not more than two members may have a term expiring in the same calendar year. Five of the six appointed members shall be distinguished architects, one of whom shall be experienced in landscape architecture. One appointed member shall be a city planner who may also be an architect. The Administrator shall give consideration to any nominations submitted to him from time to time by

leading national organizations in architecture, and shall consult with the Commission of Fine Arts on such nominations. No appointed member of the Board shall be eligible for reappointment for a term beginning less than two years after the expiration of his term.

(b) In all cases where the Board determines that the buildings involved are of sufficient significance, it shall make recommendations—

(1) to the Administrator on the architect and design of public buildings outside the District of Columbia, and

(2) to the Postmaster General on the architect and design of buildings to be constructed outside the District of Columbia for lease to the United States for use by the Post Office Department.

The Board may where appropriate recommend to the Administrator or to the Postmaster General the holding of competitions for the selection of such architects.

(c) Each appointed member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 per diem for each day on which he is engaged in the performance of his duties as such, and shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of such duties.

SEC. 4. The Administrator is authorized to acquire and maintain works of art for public buildings outside the District of Columbia. In addition to any amounts otherwise authorized, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for this purpose in each fiscal year, to remain available until expended, an amount equal to 1 per centum of the total amount appropriated for the preceding fiscal year for the design and construction of public buildings outside the District of Columbia.

SEC. 5. (a) The Art Advisory Board is hereby established in the General Services Administration. The Chairman of the Board shall be the Assistant Commissioner of Design of the General Services Administration, ex officio. The remaining six members of the Board shall be appointed by the Administrator from among distinguished representatives of professional fields as follows:

(1) painting, two members, of whom one shall be experienced in mural decoration;

(2) sculpture, two members, of whom one shall be experienced in monumental sculpture;

(3) the decorative arts and crafts, one member; and

(4) interior design, one member.

Such appointments shall be made by the Administrator after

giving consideration to any nominations submitted to him by leading national organizations in the respective professional fields, and after consultation with the Commission of Fine Arts, the Director of the National Collection of Fine Arts, and the Director of the National Gallery of Art. Each appointed member of the Board shall serve for a term expiring in one of the first three years succeeding the year in which he is appointed, as designated by the Administrator at the time of appointment, subject to the limitation that not more than two members and not more than one painter or sculptor may have a term scheduled to expire in the same calendar year. No appointed member of the Board shall be eligible for reappointment for a term beginning less than two years after the expiration of his term.

(b) The Board shall make recommendations to the Administrator concerning the artists and works of art to be acquired under section 4. The Board may where appropriate recommend to the Administrator the holding of competition for the selection of artists and of designs or models of works of art.

(c) The Board shall designate one of its members to meet with and advise the Architectural Advisory Board.

(d) Each appointed member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 per diem for each day on

which he is engaged in the performance of his duties as such, and shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of such duties.

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 3521

A BILL

To foster high standards of architectural excellence in the design and decoration of Federal public buildings outside the District of Columbia, and to provide a program for the acquisition and preservation of works of art for such buildings, and for other purposes, to be known as the Federal Fine Arts and Architecture Act.

By Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. HART, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YARBOROUGH

JUNE 16, 1966
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Public Works

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 3602

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 12, 1966

Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Mr. MCGOVERN) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Public Works

A BILL

To prohibit, without the express approval of Congress, any construction which would result in altering the proportions, changing the size, or modifying the United States Capitol Building in any substantial manner, and to establish a commission to study the existing and future needs of the Congress with respect to such building.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—INCREASES IN SIZE OF CAPITOL BUILDING REQUIRING APPROVAL OF THE CONGRESS

SEC. 101. On and after the date of the enactment of this Act, no work shall be carried out with respect to any

Exhibit 8

project which would alter the proportions, change the size, or modify the United States Capitol Building in any substantial manner, unless such project has been specifically authorized by legislation enacted by the Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 201. (a) There is hereby established a commission to be known as the "United States Capitol Building Commission" (referred to hereinafter as the "Commission") which shall be composed of seventeen members as follows:

(1) Four Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, of whom two shall be appointed from the majority party and two from the minority party;

(2) Four Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, of whom two shall be appointed from the majority party and two from the minority party;

(3) The Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts or his designee;

(4) The Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission or his designee;

(5) Three members appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent

of the Senate, from at least six oustanding architects nominated by the American Institute of Architects;

(6) One member appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from at least three members of the American Historical Association nominated by such association;

(7) One member appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from at least three members of the American Political Science Association nominated by such association; and

(8) Two members from private life, appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b) The President of the United States shall designate as Chairman one of the members appointed pursuant to paragraph (5), (6), (7), or (8) of subsection (a) of this section. The Commission shall elect a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Nine members of the Commission, of whom at

least five shall have been appointed pursuant to paragraph (4), (5), (6), (7), or (8) of subsection (a) of this section, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

(e) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949. The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U.S.C. 55 (a)), but at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals.

SEC. 202. (a) Members of the Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members of the Commission appointed pursuant to paragraph (3) or (4) of section 201 (a) of this Act shall receive no additional compensation by virtue of their membership on the Commission, but shall continue to receive the salary of their regular positions when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission. Such

members shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members of the Commission appointed pursuant to paragraph (5), (6), (7), or (8) of section 201 (a) of this Act shall each receive compensation at the rate of $75 per day when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

SEC. 203. It shall be the duty of the Commission to make a full and complete study and analysis of the present and anticipated future needs of the United States Congress with respect to the Capitol Building, including work space for the Members of Congress, committees of Congress, and staff personnel thereof, and facilities required for the convenience of visitors to the Capitol Building. It shall be the further duty of the Commission, on the basis of such study and analysis, to prepare and recommend a comprehensive and detailed plan for the suitable development of the Capitol Building in order to meet the aforementioned needs. Such plan shall be prepared with the goal of preserving for future generations the historical integrity and proportions of the Capitol Building, with particular emphasis upon preserving the existing architectural design.

SEC. 204. During the course of its study the Commission may submit to the President and the Congress such reports as the Commission shall consider advisable. The Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress a final report with respect to it findings and recommendations not later than one year following the date of the first meeting of the Commission.

SEC. 205. There are hereby authorized to be appointed to the Commission such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 206. The Commission shall cease to exist thirty days after submitting its final report as required under section 204 of this Act.

10 October 1966

Dear Mr. Knott:

The preliminary design for an Air Rights building at 3rd and Independence Avenue was considered at the September 21st meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts. We approve of the general direction and will look forward to seeing more detail in the future.

The location of the building benefits the Mall composition by balancing the Labor Department Building on Constitution Avenue. And the relationship of the proposed structure to the Rayburn Building and the Health, Education and Welfare Building make it desirable to use the architect's full recommended height.

There was one item of particular concern to the Commission. The design of the roof trusses lacked consistency and the use of exposed steel members poses some serious questions in our minds. This matter was discussed in some depth with Mr. Breuer. He assured us that this aspect of the design was still very preliminary and that he would study it much more thoroughly.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Honorable Lawson B. Knott
Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit P

10 October 1966

Dear Mr. Hartzog:

In reviewing some of the developments that have happened in Washington over the past summer we noticed the news release on the proposed skating rink in the new reflecting pool on the east end of the Mall. This is of great concern to the Commission of Fine Arts. We are completely opposed to such a facility. It is entirely out of keeping with the setting of the Capitol and destroys the whole idea of the new reflecting pool. A permanent facility of this sort runs contrary to the character of this area, which should be obvious to us all.

The only appropriate place for such an undertaking is off the axis of the Mall in an informal setting amongst the trees or open fields of East or West Potomac Park, or, as I believe was suggested on a previous occasion, near the reflecting pool along Constitution Avenue. Any permanent operation on the Mall proper is out of the question. As plans for the development of the reflecting pool are moving rapidly ahead it is essential that the Committee's recommendation on the reflecting pool location be reconsidered. We regret that the Ad Hoc Committee on Skating Facilities acted on such short notice when it was not possible to get the views of the full Commission.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. George B. Hartzog, Jr.
Director
National Park Service
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit O

10 October 1966

Dear Mr. Jett:

It appears that the design of Lafayette Square park has come full circle since our last review. The Commission had thought that its recommendations were clear in regard to the proposed changes. As you will recall, we strongly emphasized that improvements to the park should be limited to up-grading the existing materials, especially the paving and surrounding sidewalks, and that no other major changes in design should be undertaken. Yet the last submission, considered at our September meeting, reintroduces additional paving, hedges, sitting areas and flower beds, all of which the Commission thinks are inappropriate. The band-shell is particularly out of place.

Our position remains unchanged. Lafayette Square is primarily a setting for the White House. It is a handsome park as it is and meets this function in every respect. In our opinion, the proposed changes would only serve to weaken the design and we therefore strongly recommend against them.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. T. Sutton Jett
Regional Director
National Park Service - National Capital Region
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C.

P.S. Sutton: - I've had conversation with Mrs. Mellon and agreed to meet with her and her architect to try to iron out the matter.

W.W.

Exhibit R

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
20 September 1966

AM
10:15 I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. Dates of Next Meeting:
   Executive Session: 18 October 1966, 10:15 a.m.
   Open Session: 19 October 1966, 9:30 a.m.

2. Proposed Budget - Fiscal Year 1968

3. Status of Special Studies:

   a. Graphics and Street Furniture
   b. Parking Lot Study
   c. Historic Georgetown Survey
   d. The President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty - Report of Council

III. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

1. Pennsylvania Avenue Commission

   a. Paving and Landscaping of Pennsylvania Avenue

   b. National Gallery Sculpture Garden

   c. Reflecting and Skating Pool, East End of Mall

2. National Capital Transportation Agency

   Subway Design and Station Locations

3. District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency

   Tenth Street Mall

   (1) Overlook and Parking Facilities

   (2) Lighting Standards

4. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

   a. Air Rights Building, 3rd and Independence Avenue, S.W.- Feasibility Study

   b. Howard University Physical Education Building for Women - Proposed Design

c. Howard University - University Center Building - Proposed Design

d. Gerontology Building, N.I.H.-Selection of Artist

5. American Battle Monuments Commission

Guam Memorial

6. Department of the Treasury, Bureau of the Mint

New York City National Shrines Medal

7. District of Columbia Government

a. District Commissioners

Review of Presbyterian Church Tower

b. Department of Licenses and Inspections

Shipstead-Luce Act

(1) Extension of CFA Authority to New York Avenue, N.W.

(2) S.L. 67-18, Office Building, 1510 H St., N.W.

(3) S.L. 67-24, Office Building, South Capitol St. & E St., S.W.

(4) S.L. 67-17, Union Station, Resurfacing of Concourse Roof

(5) Appendix I

Old Georgetown Act

(1) O.G. 67-50, Georgetown University Library

(2) Appendix II

IV. LEGISLATION

1. H.J. Res. 1232-7/26/66-Mr. Scheuer-89thC

To provide for the formulation, adoption, administration, and periodic updating of a comprehensive development plan for the United States Capitol Grounds and contiguous related and influencing areas.

H.R.14205-5/10/66-Old Georgetown Market

2. H.R. 12119-89th Congress

To authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to replace the existing Fourteenth Street Bridge, also known as the Highway Bridge, across the Potomac River, and for other purposes.

3. H.R. 17124-8/17/66-Mr. Whitener-89thC

To authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to lease airspace in freeway rights-of-way within the District of Columbia.

4. S.J. Res. 116-10/17/65-Mr. Jackson-89thC

To provide for the administration and development of Pennsylvania Avenue as a national historic site.

5. S.J.Res. 119-10/19/65-Mr. Simpson-89thC

Authorizing the Hungarian Freedom Fighters' Federation to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs.

6. S. 3398-5/25/66-Mr. Carlson-89thC

To provide for the installation of an eternal flame at the Tomb of the Unknowns in Arlington National Cemetery

7. S. 3521-6/16/66-Mr. Muskie-89thC

To foster high standards of architectural excellence in the design and decoration of Federal Public buildings outside the District of Columbia, and to provide a program for the acquisition and preservation of works of art for such buildings, and for other purposes, to be known as the Federal Fine Arts and Architecture Act.

8. S. 3602-7/12/66-Mr. Yarborough-89thC

To prohibit, without the express approval of Congress, any construction which would result in altering the proportions, changing the size, or modifying the United States Capitol Building in any substantial manner, and to establish a commission to study the existing and future needs of the Congress with respect to such building.

V. INTERVIEWS

3:00 1. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

Air Rights Building, 3rd and Independence Avenue, S.W.-
Feasibility Study
(Mr. Marcel Breuer, architect)

3:30 2. Pennsylvania Avenue Commission

a. National Gallery Sculpture Garden

b. Reflecting and Skating Pool, East End of Mall

(Mr. John Woodbridge, Pennsylvania Avenue Commission)

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.
21 September 1966

INDEX

		Page
	SUBMISSIONS-INTERVIEWS	
1.	District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency	
	Tenth Street Mall Overlook Parking Facilities and Street Lighting Standards	1
2.	Pennsylvania Avenue Commission	
	Paving and Landscaping of Pennsylvania Avenue	2
3.	National Capital Transportation Agency	
	Subway Design and Station Locations	2
4.	General Services Administration, Public Buildings Svc	
	Howard University, Physical Education Building for Women and University Center Building	2
5.	District of Columbia Government	
	Shipstead-Luce Act	
	(1) Union Station-Resurfacing of Concourse Roof	2-3
	(2) Office Bldg., South Capitol & E Sts., S.W.	3
	(3) Office Building, 1510 H St., N.W.	3
	Old Georgetown Act	
	Georgetown University Library	3-4

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

The second session of the regular monthly meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts was held in the office of the Interior Department Building on 21 September 1966, at 9:30 a.m., with Chairman William Walton presiding.

Present were: William Walton
Gordon Bunshaft
Burnham Kelly
Theodore Roszak
Hideo Sasaki

Staff: C.H.Atherton, Secretary
Donald Myer, Asst. Secy
Nancee Black, Legislative Asst.
Myra Younker, Editor

Recorder: Steve Miller

II. SUBMISSIONS-INTERVIEWS

1. District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency

Tenth Street Mall Overlook Parking Facilities and Street Lighting Standards

Executive Director, RLA, Thomas Appleby, other officials of the agency, and Dan Kiley, landscape consultant, attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

According to Director Appleby, the cost of providing underground parking adequate for this site near the Aquarium and adjacent to the Ponte Vecchio type bridge was not economically feasible.

Speaking for the Commission, Mr. Sasaki stated that cost is relative since so much money had been spent on plans for this area. Considering it false economy to spend a fortune on a plan and then economize on the last phase of its development, the members disapproved any surface parking at this site and recommended that the area be retained as a park and an underground garage planned.

The Commission approved the design for light standards and requested that incandescent lights be used in this area.

The Commission's actions on the above two projects were forwarded to

RLA. EXHIBITS A,B

2. Pennsylvania Avenue Commission

Paving and Landscaping of Pennsylvania Avenue (Cancelled)

3. National Capital Transportation Agency:

Subway Design and Station Locations

Representatives of NCTA including Administrator Walter McCarter and Harry Weese, architect, attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

The original concept of this project was to design an underground system which would make it a pleasant experience to ride and encourage people to use it. Two approaches to the problem were the simple depression and the massive concrete tunnel. Slides of sketches depicting these and the general direction the architect is taking were shown and discussed. The members of the Commission commented on the exits/entrances located to prevent a surface jam of cars and pedestrians, weatherlocks between the surface and the stations, cooling and heating the stations.

The Commission approved in general the approach to the problem. NCTA was notified of the members' approval. EXHIBIT C

4. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

Howard University, Physical Education Building for Women and University Center Building (Cancelled)

5. District of Columbia Government

Shipstead-Luce Act

(1) Union Station - Resurfacing of Concourse Roof

Representing the Washington Terminal Company which manages Union Station, Mr. Harris attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

Speaking for the Commission, Mr. Bunshaft affirmed its previous disapproval of the plan to cover the existing skylight. The members advised that the roof be repaired, the lower glass ceiling cleaned, or that a system of artificial lighting be installed between the roof and the ceiling which would simulate daylight through the ceiling.

The Commission's disapproval was forwarded to officials of the Washington Terminal Company and to the Department of Licenses and Inspections of the District of Columbia Government. EXHIBIT D

(2) Office Building, South Capitol & E Sts., S.W. (Cancelled)

(3) Office Building - 1510 H Street, N.W.

Wendall B. Hallett, architect, attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

The two panels extending forward from the property line accentuated the vertical element of the building. In reply to the Commission's request that the building be set back and these panels eliminated, Mr. Hallett commented that this would be unfeasible economically. While economics is a factor in any building program, the Commission felt that design is also a factor and in this project, design had not been considered.

Speaking for the Commission, Mr. Bunshaft recommended that darker exterior materials (glass and precast concrete) be used, the building be set back and the vertical panels eliminated.

The Commission's disapproval with a request that the design be re-studied and consideration given to the above recommendations was reported to the Department of Licenses and Inspections of the District of Columbia Government.

Old Georgetown Act

Georgetown University Library

Father Collins of the University and representatives of John Carl Warnecke and Associates, architectural firm, attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

Father Collins' presentation and discussion with the Commission was primarily of the site south of Healy Hall. The members continued their discussion in Executive Session after Father Collins, et. al. had departed from the conference room. The transcript of this discussion is EXHIBIT E.

The Commission voted 4-2 in favor of this site and the design concept, in general. Messrs. Bunshaft, Kelly, Roszak, and Sasaki were in favor; Chairman Walton and Mrs. Saarinen, who had specified her vote on the previous day were opposed; and John Carl Warnecke was absent.

The Commission's approval was reported to the Department of Licenses and Inspections, District of Columbia Government, with the members'

request that design details be submitted for review.

The meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

10 October 1966

Dear Mr. Appleby:

After further study of the two schemes you presented for the parking facilities at the 10th Street Overlook site we feel there is a good possibility of developing the one which employs a park like setting on the roof of the garage. As you know, the other scheme with the extensive concrete trellis and surface parking was thought to be completely inappropriate by the Commissions members, for obvious reasons, I believe. By completely eliminating cars from the surface, and with use of a natural planting of trees, most objectionable features of the parking facility would be removed.

We will, of course, need to see further details of such a design, in particular the portal entrances and any retaining walls that may be necessary due to differences in grades. Sections and elevations showing dimensions and materials would be most helpful. We would be happy to review this material when it is ready.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Thomas Appleby
Executive Director
D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency
919 18th Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C.

Exhibit A

10 October 1966

Dear Mr. Appleby:

The Commission of Fine Arts approves the design of the lighting standard on the 10th Street Mall, which you submitted at our September meeting.

If the lighting intensity is not sufficient in the present fixture, we would also go along with the architect's suggestion that the number of globes be increased from 5 to 7, even though this is probably less desirable.

We do insist on one point and that is the light source should be incandescent. The lighting pattern for the entire Mall area is incandescent and to introduce high powered mercury vapor lights in this area would be entirely inappropriate. We would be glad to give you any support we can in persuading the Highway Department to proceed along these lines.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Thomas Appleby
Executive Director
D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency
919 18th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit B

10 October 1966

Dear Mr. McCarter:

The Commission of Fine Arts was happy to see the progress being made on designs for subway stations. Mr. Weese's approach is thorough and above all imaginative, and we look forward to following the detailed developments.

The Commission had reservations about the crossing over Rock Creek and Connecticut Avenue. As Mr. Rannells has told you, Mr. Jett and I met with him informally to discuss the Rock Creek crossing and both recommended boring directly through the bridge. This would damage the landscape least and the bridge itself would screen the subway's paraphernalia.

The Commission looks forward to seeing further studies along this line.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Walter J. McCarter
Administrator
National Capital Transportation Agency
Washington, D.C. 20432

Exhibit C

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

WILLIAM WALTON, Chairman
GORDON BUNSHAFT — ALINE B. SAARINEN
BURNHAM KELLY — HIDEO SASAKI
THEODORE ROSZAK — JOHN CARL WARNECKE
CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

September 21, 1966

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON

Dear Mr. Green:

At its meeting on 21 September, the Commission of Fine Arts carefully considered the application by the Washington Terminal Company to cover over the glass skylight on the roof of the concourse at Union Station. The work as presently proposed would have the effect of shutting off the light that comes through the glazed ceiling over the passenger space thus changing entirely the character and design of the room as originally conceived. Under no circumstances would the Commission approve such a change. The Commission considers this building to be one of the important landmarks in the nation's capital and every effort should be made to protect and preserve this building in its original form.

We understand completely the nature of the problems of leakage in the roof facing the terminal management, but we do not agree with their solutions. Either the roof must be repaired, retaining the glazing and copper flashing in its present form or a system of lighting within the interior of the truss must be installed to simulate natural lighting conditions if any modification is to be made to the skylight. This latter method will probably entail considerable expense and as such is far less desirable than limiting the project to minor repairs of the existing condition. We therefore strongly recommend the former course.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Julian P. Green
Assistant Superintendent
of Licenses and Permits
106 District Building
Washington, D. C. 20004

Exhibit D

73

planning for our university. Given the fact that it would be right next to the dormitory, we reserve that entire area down there for a complex.

Our dormitories are here running right straight across behind this with future dormitories, allowing our academic expansion to be in here (indicating).

I am making a very strong plea because I believe when I was here before for this building -- this is New South -- I had tried to ask for permission to format this building an entirely different way, and I didn't present my case strongly enough, I don't believe, so I have here an orange box.

I am here with the sense, I believe, real and intellectual integrity as part of my thesis, this is my conviction after years of being concerned with it. This is the correct site. This building is at the height of the 1910 Act. It is the proper place for flow for students and professors. It is an ideal location for a library.

Salve meliori judicii, i. e., with deference to questioning by superior judgment the thesis is presented.

MR. SASAKI: Mr. Chairman, can I make a point.

Did I hear you say that the National Capital Planning Commission recommended an alternate site to that?

FATHER COLLINS: That is right.

MR. SASAKI: What is their position at the present

End Tape A.
SM:jmu

Tape B.
SM:jmu

time?

FATHER COLLINS: Their position is they made this recommendation to the Board of Zoning Adjustment, and the Board of Zoning Adjustment in determination placed it here. In other words, National Capitol is a recommending agency to the Board of Zoning Adjustment, decision agency. The decision agency has placed it here (indicating).

MR. KELLY: Let me pursue that, the decision agency didn't place it there, just refused to let it go to 37th Street?

FATHER COLLINS: And also in the interior of the campus.

MR. KELLY: It would allow it nowhere on your campus except in there?

FATHER COLLINS: No, it had 3 choices, and took this one.

MR. SASAKI: They permitted it to be here, but they would also permit it elsewhere?

FATHER COLLINS: That is very true, if we so find.

MR. SASAKI: The decision is they would give 3 alternates. The decision to place it here is precisely yours?

FATHER COLLINS: No, it is theirs. They had the three.

MR. SASAKI: But they another too? I am just giving facts.

FATHER COLLINS: They state the fact in their written

decision of the recommendation of this Commission, the recommendation of the National Capital Planning Commission, plus ours.

Their decision was this site is approved.

MR. KELLY: Approved but not required?

FATHER COLLINS: Precisely. If we get another site, we have to go back and ask permission.

MR. KELLY: I gather that the Zoning Board of Adjustmen in treating those parts of the town immediately above you is going to insist on a 40 foot height all the way down the hill -- not any relazation as you go down.

FATHER COLLINS: I am not going to plan it that way. I don't believe I have a chance -- a chance of getting it.

They are going to insist on the street pattern being followed.

MR. SASAKI: Wouldn't that sort of deny your strong argument for the position of this library here in relation to the site of your previous presentation, master plan, propelling reason for placing it here because so much of the lower area was going to be for academic purposes?

FATHER COLLINS: I would like to state that it completely enhances our argument. What we had was a different format of buildings on here. We are going to use the same space for the different presentation.

MR. KELLY: Lower density. Will there be classrooms?

FATHER COLLINS: Seminars.

MR. KELLY: You continue for your long range development plans to assume you are going to have to move into the town?

FATHER COLLINS: No, until 1985. The decision of the National Capitol Planning placing its line, just off 35th Street, putting a height restriction on me, means the position I have -- it has to be spread out in houselike form.

MR. KELLY: I realize that; but as I understand it, inevitably over the course of the next 30 to 40 years Georgetown University is going to have to occupy some blocks of Georgetown. There is no doubt about that, is there? Otherwise the location of your library here would be peripheral

FATHER COLLINS: We will use those blocks that are immediately in front of us in a different way, that is to say with different kinds of buildings, educational buildings in these blocks, and the answer to your question is yes.

MR. ROSZAK: Father Collins, you suggested that this of course has been the result of a long protracted study and that related to this study you had recourse to sound out the citizens of a representative -- citizens of Georgetown. What is their reaction?

FATHER COLLINS: The citizens in terms of their presentation on the Board of Zoning Adjustment in public hearing did not object to this site. Unofficially they

77

approved it; but in formal record they have not objected to this site. They are violently objecting to my use of a house outside for interim use for an office; but on this position here, they did not object.

MR. KELLY: They presumably would also vehemently object to your using the 37th Street site if you had to go up 6 stories?

FATHER COLLINS: Yes, you mean here (indicating), is that what you mean, the present site?

MR. KELLY: No, the alternative site, if you had to go to 6 stories there, you would not get anywhere with anyone.

FATHER COLLINS: That is very true. After the decision of the Capitol Planning Commission, it is futile.

MR. ROSZAK: I just make one addendum to my remarks. Assuming that the citizens of Georgetown are not disfavorably inclined toward this project, can you imagine any reason at all beyond esthetic considerations why they should be dissatisfied with this present site location?

FATHER COLLINS: No, they approve it. Officially when they don't object, it means they approve it.

MR. ROSZAK: In other words, they have taken everything into consideration including land values, including potential development, including esthethic values and have decided that this is agreeable to them?

FATHER COLLINS: That is right. Not only site, but

building itself.

MR. ROSZAK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Bunshaft, do you have anything to ask?

MR. BUNSHAFT: I don't have anything to ask. I have something to say. In your first presentation we were concerned about two things: site and architect, and I think the exterior has been vastly improved, and I think this model as far as I am concerned explains the relationship that I personally -- I say personally -- think it is very good.

FATHER COLLINS: I am pleased.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That doesn't say this Commission does. There are 6 members.

FATHER COLLINS: I am desperate, gentlemen, in terms of time; and I would ask that you please, Mr. Chairman, that after the presentation if I could get whatever recommendations would be forthcoming at a very early opportunity.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: You will hear from us. Do you want to ask the architect any questions?

MR. KELLY: I would just like to ask Father Collins one more question. Obviously it has been clear from the start that our concern is much more with the situs of the building than it is with the architecture. We have talked at length about the alternative site across the street in

Georgetown itself and about the alternative site elsewhere on the campus. You feel very strongly that none of these are reasonable possibilities. I wish you would give us a few words on this.

FATHER COLLINS: Fine. Well, the two topographic sites that lend itself naturally was this one, plus the one the Commission itself had picked out from the topography last time, the one on this block (indicating).

The position of the National Capitol Planning Commission had suggested that we place it in here and we have a study of it made. Our new dormitory, New South, is here (indicating), and we have two more scheduled to go here (indicating). The use of these fields, our athletic field is in this area, plus here (indicating) with our gymnasium here with an addition of the gym plant here, with student living, makes from a planning point of view, to place the library in here (indicating) one that is less advantageious, especially now that you can seriously make a layout of architectural layout and expansion with the decision of the Planning Commission to make this an educational composite with the library being central.

MR. KELLY: The land to the north is absolutely unavailable to you?

FATHER COLLINS: Yes, in this particular area we went over to see the Sisters about two months ago and then again a month later, and the ability for us practically to acquire

the land doesn't exist. They have been there since we started in 1879, and the land was given to them in 1783.

They have their own program. It is not realistic for us to plan on it.

MR. KELLY: I know very little about their program. Is it pretty--

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Women's College. It doesn't have any approval yet.

MR. KELLY: So it would companion your operation then?

FATHER COLLINS: Yes. We do planning with them, positioning of our buildings in here, and a women's dormitory up here (indicating).

MR. KELLY: So that is 30 or 40 years from now, a site to the north, so the library would really be central to the whole college?

FATHER COLLINS: I think this would be really advantageious because the access to it from here plus the revised plan of the District of Columbia for a road access back to here -- Our real problem is planning property for parking, buildings, and we have to get an accessway for our parking elements; and we have it here, and we plan parking in through here (indicating), with a main entrance, that is, using entrance for students and professors back here (indicat

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Any other comments? Do you want to ask the architect something?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Than you very much. You will hear from us promptly.

FATHER COLLINS: I am very appreciative.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I think we better best go into executive session at this point.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Charlie, we are going into executive session at this moment.

What is your pleasure, gentlemen?

MR. KELLY: I guess we better go out there.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That was a real performance.

MR. KELLY: Too much of a performance.

Mr. Roszak: I think it is a very welcome change; Mr. Kelly.

MR. KELLY: Yes.

MR. SASAKI: On his thesis, the point is that he contends that we have no business discussing the site. We can turn around and say that his presentation concerned the building itself, and that is our prerogative, so he has no business making use of it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: One man's gestalt is another man's poison.

MR. SASAKI: It seems the problem is an interrelated one I was going to say that we are not interested only in the site, but its integral part. Did we ever say this was not a

buildable site or usable site? This wasn't our contention. He tried to put the wrong thesis in our minds which I wouldn't accept intellectually.

MR. ROSZAK: He is presenting what he called the gestalt values.

MR. SASAKI: That is for us to determine whether it is gestalt or not.

MR. ROSZAK: He is not telling you that it is. You still make up your mind about it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Thank you for allowing us to still make up our minds. Very kind of you.

MR. SASAKI: I think that should be our view.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I am embarrassed to have this man sell something that perhaps wasn't even necessary to be sold. I personally think -- it doesn't make any difference what he says. I don't know anything about this site. I think we are making -- I think it is the best thing Warnecke has ever been near. I think he couldn't do a better job, forgetting any of these feelings, we have said before, and this building relating to that, and the site and the whole thing. I think it is embarrassing that we were not in a position to cut him short and say this is what we have decided.

That is my feeling. that is why I express my feelings. I am not going to sit here -- well, I felt sorry for him. I think he is a rather unusual client. He is a hard pitched

83

salesman, but I think he believes in this building.

MR. KELLY: Not only that, but he has had good men making studies.

MR. BUNSHAFT: What the hell difference does it make if some other site is affected or alternate -- this is the third time he has been here, isn't it? Anyhow, we will go to the site.

MR. SASAKI: I think the best approach is not to get into public squabble about this. We had attempted the conclusion before he made his sales pitch, you know.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It would have been nice if we could have settled it before.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, my feeling is that you are all totally familiar with the project, every phase of it; and I don't see why you need to go to the site.

MR. ROSZAK: I don't see that you would see anything other than what is in that photograph.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: You have seen it inside and outside.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I have made up my mind. If I don't understand my mind, I ought to quit architecture. In fact this model is better than that, because it relates to these two; and as I say, where I am sitting, you really see the high part.

MR. KELLY: Gordon, I don't think -- nobody has ever said this wasn't a sensitive handling of the site.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We have to say yes or no. I have made up my mind, "yes."

MR. KELLY: Nobody from the beginning in this Commission has ever said this wasn't a good solution in using this site. Gordon is saying it is a good approach to the site.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think we aren't in a position to tell them where to put a library in their campus planning. I think we are usurping the power. We don't know about the master planning, neither should we be involved in it. Just like the Planning Commission gets into our act; we are getting into their act.

MR. KELLY: I disagree with you completely. Talk about the National Institute of Health. If we think they are doing a lousy job, and we insist, they change.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That is an overall pattern.

MR. KELLY: This is too. This is too. We have never complained about the architecture.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think this is a good location. What are we talking about? Most of us have made up our minds, and we just keep trying to be tactful. Some are, I am not.

MR. SASAKI: Since I made the suggestion yesterday that we go see the site, I withdraw the suggestion providing it satisfies everyone.

MR. KELLY: I am very familiar with the site.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I have lived with the site for 20 years.

MR. ROSZAK: I think that building is going to enhance the skyline better than anything there is adjacent to Healy.

MR. KELLY: Since we have got a flat ruling apparently from both the Planning Commission and Zoning Commission, it is going to hold the 40 foot line in the town -- we are better off to have that halfway above that by far.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Do you wish to vote on the subject now? All in favor of approving this bill say Aye.

(Mr. Bunshaft, Mr. Kelly, Mr. Roszak, and Mr. Sasaki voted Aye.)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: So ordered.

Mrs. Saarinen wishes to be recorded as opposed and so does the chairman.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I like the way he does it.

I would like to say one thing, however, that we ought to follow the details of the exterior of this job very closely, materials and details. I think we ought to be very sure about that because they can really bundle it with some purple or other, green concrete -- you know.

It should be warm in tone.

MR. SASAKI: What do you think of this suggestion, of this slope to this building? I think this is goulash. We ought to ask him to study the front relationship of this. I think he can build a wall or something like a mote here.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Couldn't we say they ought to appear

at the next meeting, that we have certain things we want to discuss with them about details and to prepare for the next meeting, the master plan -- what they envision in the future?

MR. KELLY: Good.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Do we have as much control over this as say that Italian apartment house?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No, I don't think so.

MR. ATHERTON: Not strictly speaking. In terms of the law, we make recommendations, instead of approving or disapproving; but I think in reality, under the circumstances we have pretty firm control over the design.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We could follow the materials.

MR. ATHERTON: Sure. The act specifies color and all kinds of details.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I would think that was rather problematical now. I think our control has slipped a great deal today. He has got what he wants now, I think.

Does anyone have anymore business to bring up?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: If not, we are adjourned.

(Whereupon at 11:55 o'clock, a.m., the meeting was adjourned.)

End

SM:jmu

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
21 September 1966

AM

9:30 I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

II. SUBMISSIONS-INTERVIEWS

9:30 1. District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency

Tenth Street Mall Overlook Parking Facilities and Street Lighting Standards

(Mr. Thomas Appleby and representatives of D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency)

10:00 2. Pennsylvania Avenue Commission

Paving and Landscaping of Pennsylvania Avenue

(Mr. Dan Kiley, Landscape Architect; Mr. John Woodbridge, Pennsylvania Avenue Commission)

10:15 3. National Capital Transportation Agency

Subway Design and Station Locations

(Mr. Harry Weese, architect; representatives of National Capital Transportation Agency)

10:45 4. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. Howard University Physical Education Building for Women - Proposed Design

b. Howard University - University Center Building - Proposed Design

(representatives of Justement, Elam, Callmer & Kidd, architects)

11:00 5. District of Columbia Government

Shipstead-Luce Act

(1) S.L. 67-17, Union Station - Resurfacing of Concourse Roof
(2) S.L. 67-24, Office Building - South Capitol & E St., S.W.
(3) S.L. 67-18, Office Building - 1510 H St., N.W.

11:30 Old Georgetown Act

O.G. 67-50, Georgetown University Library

Jun 15, 2017